BETHEL SEMINARY LIBRARY
REG 232.3 C125
Cadoux, Ceci The Message about the cros
3 0513 0001 0881 7

# THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE CROSS

C. J. CADOUX

11

A. Jones
28 Argyle St.
Dundee

Read 18/7/25.

# THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE CROSS

*BY THE SAME AUTHOR*

THE GUIDANCE OF JESUS FOR TO-DAY. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 7s. 6d.; paper, 3s. 6d.

"It recalls by a shock to the bewildering problem of applied Christianity, and makes us once more suitably uncomfortable. . . . I want everybody to read it."—Canon JAMES ADDERLEY in the *Church Family Newspaper*.

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

"It will make its way by the demand for such a work, and by the exact and patient scholarship with which that demand has been met."—DR. ORCHARD in Foreword.

# THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE CROSS

## A FRESH STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT

BY

C. J. CADOUX
M.A., D.D.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C. 1

*First published in 1924*

*The Library*
BETHEL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL MINNESOTA

S38879

(*All rights reserved*

*Printed in Great Britain*

C125

To

MY FRIEND

HAROLD OLAF HODGKIN

OF THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

BY WHOSE BROTHERLY SUGGESTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT

I HAVE BEEN HELPED TO WRITE AND TO

PUBLISH THIS BOOK

Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ . . . δύναμις Θεοῦ ἐστίν.

("The message about the Cross . . . is the power of God.")

PAUL (1 Cor 1. 18).

# PREFACE

THE way in which this little book came to be written is easily explained. In October 1921 I was enabled, by the courtesy of the Editor of *The Interpreter*, to publish in that journal an article entitled 'The Fellowship of His Sufferings,' in which I endeavoured to set forth my thoughts, as they then were, on the subject of the Atonement and its connection with Christian ethics. At the 1923 Easter Settlement arranged by the 1905 Committee of the Yorkshire Quarterly Meeting of the Society of Friends, at Grassington, I was asked to speak on 'The Gospel of the Cross for the Mind of To-day'; and I used the *Interpreter*-article as the basis of my lecture. Some of those present asked that they might have the lecture in print; and the request moved me to write down afresh, and with all the fulness the subject seemed to require, the line of thought I had followed. The manuscript was ready by July 1923; but considerable delay was involved in negotiating for its publication, and it is only now that the conclusion of final arrangements has been possible. The delay has, however, had the incidental advantage of enabling me to submit the manuscript to more than one thorough revision, to test the statements again and again in the light of further thought, and to enrich them from my later reading.

A word may be said by way of apology for the abundance of the footnotes and quotations. These

have not been inserted by way of parade, to "make a fair show in the flesh," but in order that students of the subject may be able, if they desire to do so, to compare the argument, step by step, with what other modern writers, who have made contributions to the solution of the problem, are saying. Of these modern writers, I find myself most in agreement with Mr. W. E. Wilson and the late Canon Rashdall, whose books, however, I had not read until just before the final revision of the manuscript. With Mr. Wilson's excellent little pamphlet, *Atonement and Non-Resistance*, I think I agree throughout. Canon Rashdall's very much fuller treatment here and there leaves something to be desired; and I have ventured in places to indicate where I diverge from or wish to supplement his views. I have also found Rev. Principal J. P. S. R. Gibson's little pamphlet, *The Highway of the Cross*, very helpful and suggestive on the theological side. Readers who do not wish to be troubled with footnotes and references will find that they can get a grasp of the whole argument by simply keeping to the text and ignoring the notes.

I wish to express my thanks to my friend, the Rev. Canon Hewlett Johnson, Editor of *The Interpreter*, for his kind permission to use the article alluded to above as the basis of this book, and also to Mr. H. O. Hodgkin, secretary of the "Yorkshire 1905 Committee," for his sympathy and patience in connection with its publication.

I lay down my pen with a humbling sense of having been unequal to so great a task as that which I have undertaken. It is possible that to some of my readers the whole method in which the subject is treated here will seem far too matter-of-fact, logical, and prosaic, and too lacking in that warm sense of awe and humility

with which we should approach the most transcendent theme that human minds can contemplate. I would only beg such readers to believe that, whatever the appearances may suggest, I have been conscious throughout of the greatness and sanctity of those realities with which I have been dealing. I do not think, indeed, that we need to apologize for applying exact and rigorous thought to the profound mysteries of our religious faith and experience; but I gladly recognize that, unless the heart feel a sense of awe and be in an attitude of reverence, the intellect will of itself achieve little. And even with this sense and this attitude of heart it is not more than a limited distance that the intellect can carry us. Our consolation is that the subject of our deliberations is such that, however imperfect be our instruments, and however provisional be our findings, we cannot handle it sincerely without receiving through it some measure of that peace-giving and enabling grace of God, of which it has never ceased to speak to the human heart.

C. J. CADOUX.

SHIPLEY, YORKSHIRE.
*June*, 1924.

# CONTENTS


PAGE

PREFACE . . . . . 7

I. OUR TASK . . . . . 17–19

II. THE SUFFERING SERVANT OF THE LORD 20–33

(*a*) The teaching about the death of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels . . . . . 20

(*b*) Isaiah liii. . . . . 21

(*c*) The Parallels between Jesus and the Servant . . 23

i. Both are prophets with a Divine and saving message for their fellow-countrymen and the world . . . . . 23

ii. Both meet with disbelief, opposition, and persecution, and eventually perish as unresisting martyrs . . . . . 23

iii. Both rely on being divinely vindicated, martyrdom being but the portal to a future life of triumph . . . . . 24

iv. For both triumph is not military or punitive, but consists in impressing and convincing others, in moving them to penitence, and so securing for them forgiveness and salvation 26

v. Of both is sacrificial language used to describe metaphorically the effect of their work. . 28

(*d*) The point of difference between Isaiah liii. and the Gospels . . . . . 30

III. THE CROSS OF JESUS IN CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE . . . . . 34–40

(*a*) Explanation in regard to terms used . . . . 34

(*b*) The Cross convinces us of the being and goodness of God . . . . . 35

PAGE

(*c*) The Cross convinces us of sin and of the consequent suffering of God . . . . . 36

(*d*) The Cross induces repentance, pardon, and moral vigour . . . . . 38

(*e*) Summary . . . . . 39

IV. SOME THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS . . 41–53

(*a*) In what sense was Jesus' death 'necessary' for human salvation ? . . . . . 41

(*b*) In what sense did Jesus die for *all* men ? . . . 44

(*c*) Does forgiveness abolish the consequences of sin ? . 46

(*d*) What difference did Jesus' death make to God ? . 47

(*e*) Where does the ultimate mystery lie ? . . . 50

V. THE SAVIOURHOOD OF THE DISCIPLE . 54–72

(*a*) "The firstborn among many brothers" . . . 54

(*b*) The work of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii. is not unique in kind . . . . . 58

(*c*) Jesus expected His disciples to die with Him, and for a like purpose . . . . . 58

(*d*) "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church," i.e. it has redemptive power . . . . . 60

(*e*) The Divine power of human goodness and self-sacrifice generally . . . . . 63

i. Human self-sacrifice redeems . . . . 63

ii. Human goodness redeems . . . . . 64

iii. Human goodness and self-sacrifice redeem by revealing God . . . . . 66

iv. Human goodness and self-sacrifice reveal God because they actually *are* God's goodness and self-sacrifice . . . . . 67

(*f*) The nature of the uniqueness of Jesus' work . . 69

(*g*) The attainment to the resurrection from the dead . 71

PAGE

VI. THE ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS . . . . 73–92

(*a*) The need of discovering the moral ground for Jesus' acceptance of death . . . . . 73

(*b*) Jesus accepted death because He believed that love involved non-resistance . . . . . 75

(*c*) This conclusion is confirmed by the story of the Temptation, etc. . . . . 77

(*d*) Inseparability of non-resistance and the Cross . . 81

(*e*) Non-resistance therefore essential to a fully Christian ethic . . . . . 83

(*f*) Its rightness does not depend upon its immediate success in any particular case . . . . . 83

(*g*) The moral dilemma presented by the danger of others 85

(*h*) The cost of the Christian resurrection. . . . . 90

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| Cadman | *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, by W. H. Cadman (Oxford Univ. Press, 1923). |
| Carter | *Why did Jesus Die?* by H. C. Carter (Teachers and Taught, 1924). No. 3 of 'Tracts for Better Times.' |
| W. N. Clarke | *An Outline of Christian Theology*, by W. N. Clarke (T. and T. Clark, 21st edn., 1914). |
| Miss Dougall in *LT* | *The Lord of Thought*, by Lily Dougall and Cyril W. Emmet (Student Christian Movement, 1922). |
| Gibson | *The Highway of the Cross*, by J. P. S. R. Gibson (Hodder, 1924). No. 8 of pamphlets issued by the 'Anglican Evangelical Group Movement.' |
| Glover in *CHN* | T. R. Glover's art. on 'The Death of Christ' in *Christ and Human Need* (Student Volunteer Missionary Union, 1912). |
| Glover, *CR* | *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire*, by T. R. Glover (Methuen, 7th edn., 1918). |
| Glover, *JEM* | *Jesus in the Experience of Men*, by T. R. Glover (Student Christian Movement, 1921). |
| Glover, *JH* | *The Jesus of History*, by T. R. Glover (Student Christian Movement, 1917). |
| Hastings, *ERE* | *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by Jas. Hastings (T. and T. Clark, 1908–1921). |
| Headlam, *LTJC* | *The Life and Teaching of Jesus the Christ*, by A. C. Headlam (Murray, 1923). |
| R. Mackintosh | *Historic Theories of Atonement, with Comments*, by Robert Mackintosh (Hodder, 1920). |
| Maltby | *The Meaning of the Cross*, by W. R. Maltby (Epworth Press, 1920). No. 10 of 'Manuals of Fellowship.' |
| Moffatt, *TG* | *The Theology of the Gospels*, by Jas. Moffatt (Duckworth, 1912). |

| | |
|---|---|
| Moulsdale | *The Sacrifice of the Mass*, by S. R. P. Moulsdale (Society of SS. Peter and Paul, 1923). No. 26 of the Anglo-Catholic 'Congress Books.' |
| Mozley | *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, by J. K. Mozley (Duckworth, 1915). |
| Rashdall | *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*, by Hastings Rashdall (Macmillan, 1920). The Bampton Lectures for 1915. |
| Wade, *NTH* | *New Testament History*, by G. W. Wade (Methuen, 1922). |
| Weinel | *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, von H. Weinel (Tübingen, Mohr, 3rd edn., 1921). |
| Wilson | *Atonement and Non-Resistance*, by Wm. E. Wilson (Swarthmore Press, 2nd edn., 1924). |

|| or ||s means the parallel passage or passages in the other Gospels.
f (or ff) means "and the following verse(s)," "page(s)," etc.

In passages translated from other languages, bracketed words are those required to make the translation read smoothly, though they have nothing corresponding to them in the original.

# THE MESSAGE ABOUT THE CROSS

## I

### *OUR TASK*

PAUL tells us that the message about the Cross, which for him was the power and wisdom of God, and which "has been in experience the piercing point of the Gospel" for multitudes of Christians since his time, was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Gentiles foolishness.[1] There are many Christians to-day who could acknowledge considerable sympathy with that Jewish perplexity, and some even who could use the harsher Gentile criticism, at least in regard to certain versions of the message wherein they have been instructed. Speaking broadly, we may say without exaggeration that, in the Christian Church of to-day, the message of the Cross is but feebly given, not through any irreverence, nor because it is regarded as unimportant, but because so much of the traditional language in which it is conveyed has become in-

[1] 1 Cor i. 18–24. On the centrality of the Cross, cf. Tertullianus, *Adv. Marcionem* iii. 8 (Totum Christiani nominis et pondus et fructus, mors Christi . . .); Mozley, p. 221 ("If the Cross is not the whole Gospel it is the Gospel's centre and enlivening power"); Bartlet and Carlyle, *Christianity in History*, p. 37 (words quoted in the text); Wilson, pp. 11, 49.

creasingly difficult, meaningless, and unusable for the modern mind. The old terms and phrases miss fire, and we have no new terms and phrases that will hit the mark. No little part of our perplexity is due to the overwhelming multitude and diversity of the various 'theories of the atonement' embodied in traditional Christian teaching and in popular Christian hymnology and other devotional literature. The great chorus of discordant voices has an effect the reverse of what any of its authors contemplated: it bewilders, and even repels, instead of attracting and explaining.

If this diagnosis of the situation is accurate, it suggests of itself at least the first steps that need to be taken towards a truer and more helpful outlook. The great flood of Christian thought, which began in the early Apostolic Age and has flowed on ever since, took its rise from a certain historical event; and if the windings of the stream confuse us, and its lower waters seem turbid, we must ascend to the fountain-head. "It is both our duty and our privilege to remember that the work of Christ itself lies back of even the most ancient and sacred illustrations that set it forth. Our proper calling . . . in the present day is, not only to study the various forms of speech which apostles"—and, we may add, later thinkers—"used (as redemption, propitiation, priesthood, sacrifice) for setting forth the meaning of what Christ wrought, but also to see whether we cannot penetrate behind them, and learn what that actual reality was which has been thus variously pictured. That reality is not fully set forth by any metaphor, even in Scripture, and we cannot be sure that it is fully represented by them all. If we could find it we might be surprised at its simplicity; we certainly should wonder at its divine beauty and naturalness. And Christian men of all ages have

equal right and equal duty to search for it." [1] Our immediate task, therefore, is to divest ourselves, for the time being at least, of all preconceived theories and explanations derived from later Christian thought, and to endeavour to reconstruct—not so much the historical details of the story of the Cross, which are already familiar to us all—but the meaning of the event in the mind of Him who was the central figure in that story. Only in so far as we can succeed in doing this, shall we be in a position of advantage such as will enable us to seize the truth enshrined in the doctrines of New Testament and later times.

[1] W. N. Clarke, p. 318.

## II

## *THE SUFFERING SERVANT OF THE LORD*

(*a*) The Teaching about the Death of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels.—For the purpose of the inquiry before us we must confine ourselves, within the New Testament, to the Synoptic Gospels: for the Fourth Gospel is known to give us rather a devotional and theological representation, than a strictly historical record, of the sayings of Jesus; and, although it may well contain many true reports of things He actually said, yet we are not at present in a position to delimit these with the confidence necessary in an investigation of this kind. Turning, therefore, to the Synoptics, we find Jesus referring from time to time to His death, but He seems to give no simple or adequate explanation of it. He foretells it,[1] speaks of it as a fulfilment of Scripture,[2] describes it as His baptism and His cup,[3] as the removal of the bridegroom from his friends,[4] and as a ransom for many.[5] At the Last Supper the cup represents His "covenant-blood, which is poured out on behalf of many."[6] Matthew's addition of the words "unto forgiveness of sins"[7] is not supported by any of the other accounts of the Supper, and is the only

[1] Mc viii. 31–33, ix. 30–32, x. 32–34, xii. 1–11 ||s; Lc xvii. 25.
[2] Mc ix. 12, xiv. 21, 49 ||s; cf. Lc xiii. 33; Mt xxvi. 54.
[3] Lc xii. 49 f; Mc x. 38 f = Mt xx. 22 f.
[4] Mc ii. 19 f ||s.
[5] Mc x. 45 = Mt xx. 28.
[6] Mc xiv. 24; cf. Lc xxii. 20.
[7] Mt xxvi. 28.

passage in the Gospels in which the forgiveness of sins is explicitly connected with the death of Jesus; it is therefore to be regarded as being in all probability a gloss added by the evangelist in order to make the words of the Master, as he thought, more clear and intelligible. While some of these passages contain ominous hints at the deep meaning of the approaching tragedy, they provide us with no comprehensive theory in regard to it. Taking them all together, we gather that Jesus looked upon His death as a terrible martyrdom destined, by a kind of Scriptural determinism natural to Jewish minds, to be guiltily perpetrated upon Him by His enemies, but destined also in some unexplained way to bestow Divine benefit on many.[1] Beyond that we can hardly go.

(*b*) Isaiah liii.—We can, however, supplement our information by taking into account those passages of the Old Testament which we know to have been most often in our Lord's mind, and which He regarded as prophecies referring to Himself. Of these, the most significant for our present purpose are the so-called 'Servant-Poems' in the second part of the Book of Isaiah, viz. Isa. xlii. 1–4, xlix. 1–6, l. 4–9, lii. 13–liii. 12. The voices from Heaven at His baptism and at His transfiguration (reflections surely of His inner consciousness) and sayings like "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many," "The Son of Man departs even as it is written of him," and "This that has been written must be fulfilled in me, 'And he was

[1] So Weinel (p. 194) summarizes Jesus' view: "Jesus saw, as any other man in his position could have seen, how the clouds of enmity were rolling up around him. Like any man would, he struggled over his death, which apparently meant also the downfall of his cause; and in his darkest hours he solved the mystery for himself with the certainty that even his death would benefit the many for whom he had devoted his life as a service." Rashdall (pp. 31 f, 37, 45 f, 51) describes the situation similarly.

reckoned among the lawless,' " all testify to the importance of the Servant-Poems in Jesus' mind.[1] The liberal use made of these poems in early Christian allusions to our Lord[2] is most easily explained by supposing that their appropriateness was first seen and pointed out by Him.[3] We may, therefore, with due caution, use these passages, along with the Synoptic Gospels, as showing us what our Lord thought of Himself; and as the last of them discourses at length on the death of the Servant, we may expect to get from it considerable light as to the view He took of the meaning of His own death.[4] To whom the Servant-Poems were meant in the first place to refer—whether to the people of Israel personified, or to the righteous minority within Israel, or to some actual historical figure (Jeremiah and Zerubbabel have both been thought of), or to some entirely imaginary personage—and whether they were composed by the author of the contexts in which they now appear, are problems of Old Testament criticism to which no generally acceptable solutions have yet been found. But, interesting

[1] Isa lxi. 1 ff is not reckoned by modern scholars among the Servant-Poems proper, but it is sufficiently similar to them to make the quotation of it by Jesus (Lc iv. 18 f) a confirmation of the argument stated above.

[2] Lc ii. 32; Mt viii. 16 f, xii. 17–21; Jn i. 29, 36; and the early chapters of Acts.

[3] E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, pp. 215–223; J. Moffatt, *TG*, pp. 139–149. The description of the Suffering Servant in Isa liii. was apparently never interpreted by pre-Christian Jews as referring to the national Messiah (Weinel, pp. 225 f).

[4] Some recent writers, e.g. Rashdall (pp. 36, 51 ff) and Cadman (pp. 152–154, 156), are disposed to deny that Jesus regarded His passion as a complete fulfilment of Isa liii., on the ground mainly that He does not actually quote the most explicit allusions in that chapter to the Servant's redemptive death. But if He regarded His death as a fulfilment of 'Scripture' (Mc xiv. 21 ||s), and verbally quoted Isa liii. 12 as fulfilled by Him (Lc xxii. 22), it seems only reasonable to believe that He regarded the *whole* of that remarkable chapter as pointing forward to Himself.

as such questions are, the settlement of them is irrelevant to our present inquiry ; to the mind of Jesus they probably never occurred, the passages appearing to Him simply as inspired and predictive Scripture.

(*c*) THE PARALLELS BETWEEN JESUS AND THE SERVANT.—We may proceed, therefore, to draw out the parallels between the figure of the Suffering Servant and that of the Jesus of history.

i. *Both are prophets with a divine and saving message for their fellow-countrymen and the world.*—" (My) judgment(s) will he send forth to the nations." " The coastlands will wait for his instruction." " It is (too) light (a thing) that thou shouldst be My Servant, to (re-)establish (only) the tribes of Jacob and to restore the scattered of Israel : therefore have I set thee as a light for the nations, that My deliverance may extend unto the end of the earth." " The Lord God has given me the tongue of a disciple, that I may know (how) to answer the weary [or the profane ?] (with) a word." [1] With these characteristics of the Servant, compare the whole picture of Jesus the Teacher in the Synoptic Gospels, with its numerous indications of the ultimately universal scope of His Good News.[2]

ii. *Both meet with disbelief, opposition, and persecution, and eventually perish as unresisting martyrs.*—" I was not refractory, nor did I turn away : my back I gave to those that struck it, and my cheeks to those that plucked them bare : my face I hid not from humiliation and spitting." " (Though) harshly treated,

[1] Isa xlii. 1, 4, xlix. 6, l. 4. The Hebrew text of the Old Testament is often corrupt and obscure, and that of Isa lii. 13–liii. is particularly so. In the quotations given in this essay, conjecture has had occasionally to be resorted to where the exact wording is doubtful. Words within round brackets are those necessitated by English idiom in order to bring out the sense of the Hebrew.

[2] E.g. Mt v. 13 f, viii. 10–12 ‖, xxi. 43, xxiv. 14 ‖, xxvi. 13 ‖ ; Lc iv. 24–27 ; Mc xi. 17.

he humbled himself, and opened not his mouth, like a sheep that is led to the slaughter, and like a ewe that is dumb before her shearers. Through oppression his right was taken away; and his fate—who gives it a thought? for he was cut off from the land of the living; through the rebellion of my people was he struck unto death. And they put his grave with the wicked, and in his death (was he ranked) with the doers of evil, although he had done no violence, nor (had there been any) deceit in his mouth . . . he poured out his life unto death, and was counted along with the rebels." [1] How close a description this, of the hostility which Jesus had to face, of His unflinching refusal to escape from it, and of the passive submission with which He endured the utmost that His foes could inflict! Whatever else the death of Jesus may have been, it was in the first place a martyrdom, brought about, as all martyrdoms are, by the collision between truth and bravery, on the one hand, and bigotry and violence on the other.[2]

iii. *Both rely on being divinely vindicated, martyrdom being but the portal to a future life of triumph.*—"Now I said, 'In vain have I wearied myself: on formless (chaos) and (mere) vapour have I spent my strength.' Yet surely my right is with the Lord, and my recompense with my God." "The Lord God helps me; therefore have I not felt humiliated; therefore have I made my face like flint, and known that I should not be put to shame. Near is he who justifies me." "Behold! my servant will prosper, and be uplifted, and be very high." "The Lord purposed to cleanse him from disease: . . . he will see (his) offspring; he

[1] Isa l. 5 f, liii. 7–9, 12.

[2] "The death of Jesus is the most conspicuous martyrdom in history" (W. H. Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 312).

will prolong (his) days; and the Lord's purpose will prosper in his hand: through the trouble of his soul will he see light; he will be satisfied . . . therefore shall he get a possession among many [or, the many], and with the mighty shall he divide the spoil."[1] Parallel to this thought is the oft-recurring anticipation, in the teaching of Jesus, of His triumphant resurrection or return on the clouds, destined to occur, according to some passages, on the third day after His death, i.e. after a short, indefinite period,[2] within the life-time of that generation,[3] but upon a day exactly known to none but God Himself.[4] The view that the resurrection and the parousia are alternative forms used to describe the same somewhat vaguely conceived future triumph is suggested by the fact that the two are never related to one another in the Gospels, and that, in the numerous passages in which the disciples are bidden to wait patiently during the period of their Master's absence, the post-resurrection appearances and occasions of intercourse are tacitly ignored. Jesus plunges into darkness of death, clinging with strong faith to the certainty of ultimate victory.

> If I stoop
> Into a dark tremendous sea of cloud,
> It is but for a time; I press God's lamp
> Close to my breast; its splendour, soon or late,
> Will pierce the gloom: I shall emerge one day.[5]

[1] Isa xlix. 4, l. 7 f, lii. 13, liii. 10–12.

[2] Such was the meaning of 'the third day' in Jewish parlance (see Hos vi. 1 f; Lc xiii. 32 f; Mt xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40; Jn ii. 19 f; probably also 1 Sam xxx. 12; 2 Kings xx. 8; Jonah i. 17; Acts ix. 9). The normal way of expressing 'recently' in Hebrew is 'yesterday (and) the third day.' The words addressed to the penitent thief (Lc xxiii. 43) are inconsistent with the idea that Jesus expected to remain in the tomb—or even in the under-world—during the days immediately following His death.

[3] Mc ix. 1 ||s.

[4] Mc xiii. 32 ||.

[5] Browning, *Paracelsus*, fin.

iv. *For both triumph is not military or punitive,*[1] *but consists in impressing and convincing others, in moving them to penitence, and so securing for them forgiveness and salvation.*—" Even as many were appalled at him, so will he startle many nations : at him will kings close their mouth(s), for they will see what has never been told them, and will contemplate what they have not heard of (before). . . . Despised (was he) and deserted by men. . . . As one from whom (men) hide (their) faces, (he was) despised, and we did not consider him. Yet (it was) our diseases (that) he carried, and our pains (that) he bore, while we considered him (as plague-) struck, smitten by God and afflicted. And he was pierced through our rebellious acts, bruised through our guilt : the chastisement (needed) for our well-being (fell) on him, and by his weal(s) have we been cured. We had all wandered like sheep ; we had turned, (every) man, his own way ; and the Lord caused to light on him the penalty of us all. . . . Though he made his life a guilt-offering, he will see (his) offspring . . . the Lord's purpose will prosper in his hand. . . . By his knowledge will My Servant make many [or, the many] righteous, and their guilt will he bear (away) . . . he carried (away) the sin of many, and for the rebels did he intercede." [2] The humble and penitent tone of the

[1] It is true that a mild threat is found in Isa l. 9 f, and also that punitive expressions sometimes occur on the lips of Jesus. But in regard to these latter we may note :

(*a*) That they nearly all occur in parables, where an exact and literal interpretation of every detail is usually a mistake.

(*b*) That certainly some, perhaps many, of them are due to Jesus' reporters rather than to Himself.

(*c*) That even those that He actually spoke belong rather to the body of Jewish religious beliefs in which He had been educated than to the teaching which is peculiar to and characteristic of Him.

(*d*) That He never makes the severity of God a reason for either injuring others Himself or advising His disciples to injure others. So far as His personal conduct and ethical teaching are concerned, He confines the imitation of God to the imitation of His benevolence.

[2] Isa lii. 14 f, liii. 3–6, 10–12.

poet, speaking for himself and his fellow-countrymen, is itself a proclamation of the Servant's victory. "The tragedy of which they" (the Servant's contemporaries) "have been spectators makes an impression far more profound and convincing than any direct teaching could have done, compelling them to recognize the mission of the Servant, and at the same time producing penitence and confession of their own sin." [1] Could we unwrap the meaning Jesus put into the phrases "a ransom for many" [2] and "my blood of the covenant poured out no behalf of many" (phrases which by their very form recall the prophet's words about "making many righteous" and "bearing away the sin of many") we should surely find that He believed that the effect of His death would be to secure "for many" that greatest of all good things, entrance into the Kingdom of God. Such entrance involved, firstly, repentance and the forgiveness of sins,[3] and then, as a consequence of this, salvation, or the progressive fulfilment of God's will in the saved life, i.e. righteous conduct and fellowship with God. But Jesus habitually taught that the one condition of Divine pardon (and therefore of all that flows from it) is genuine repentance.[4] If, therefore,

[1] Skinner, in *Cambridge Bible: Isaiah xl.–lxvi.*, p. 120; cf. R. Mackintosh, pp. 33 f.

[2] On the genuineness of the 'ransom-saying' (Mc x. 45 ||), see Moffatt, *TG*, pp. 145 f, and R. Mackintosh, pp. 48, 51. Rashdall (pp. 29–37, 49–56) doubts it.

[3] The addition of "unto remission of sins" in Mt xxvi. 28, therefore, even if it is an interpretative gloss, is an accurate one.

[4] "The fact of assured forgiveness stands firm, without any reservation being made in favour of an atoning suffering which is to follow subsequently (and) to make satisfaction as an objective 'Causa meritoria remissionis peccatorum'" (H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, i. p. 254). He quotes Mt vi. 12, xviii. 22 (? means 27), Lc xv. 20–24, xviii. 13 f, in this connection. Rashdall (pp. 23–27, 45, 48) and Weinel (pp. 226 f) express themselves similarly). "It is quite impossible to convince a man who understands the teaching of Jesus that forgiveness must wait upon the establishment of certain conditions outside the desire of recon-

Jesus believed, and as we believe, His death is a means for securing forgiveness for men, this can be so only in so far as it is a means for securing their repentance.[1]

v. *Of both is sacrificial language used to describe metaphorically the effect of their work.*—The Servant is said to make His life a guilt-offering,[2] and Jesus speaks of giving His life as a ransom on behalf of many. The former term 'guilt-offering' is obviously borrowed from the elaborate Jewish sacrificial system, under which animal life was freely destroyed with the idea that God could thereby be so conciliated as to act favourably towards men who were conscious of having in some way or other transgressed His will, or who otherwise desired to be brought into right relations with Him.[3] But the latter term 'ransom' used by Jesus is almost as certainly, if less obviously, a sacri-

ciliation" (Shailer Mathews in *The Journal of Religion*, March 1921, p. 157). The forgiving spirit towards others, which often appears (Mt vi. 12, 14 f, xviii. 23–35, Mc xi. 25) as a condition of receiving God's pardon, may be regarded simply as an important *corollary* of genuine repentance (Rashdall, p. 25).

[1] Cadman argues (pp. 113, 117, 137, 156) that Jesus deliberately looked forward to a widespread movement of repentance as the result of His death. The work of Jesus was viewed in this light by Clemens of Rome (A.D. 95), who wrote: "The blood of Christ, . . . being poured out for the sake of our salvation, offered to the whole world *the grace of repentance*" (*Epistle to Corinth.* vii. 4; but see below, p. 38 n 1). Cf. Glover, *JH*, p. 184 ("Something must be done to touch the heart and to move the will of men, effectively; and he must do it"), and W. E. Channing, *Works*, i. 544 f ("Many suppose, that this event," the death of Jesus, ". . . procures forgiveness by leading to that repentance and virtue, which is the great and only condition on which forgiveness is bestowed"). Haering's view of the atonement is similar (R. Mackintosh, pp. 229–231). Rashdall (pp. 29–49) moves all round the argument, but shrinks from drawing the very simple conclusion stated in the text, at least so far as the teaching of Jesus is concerned, though he finds a place for it (p. 48) as a doctrine *to be developed* from that teaching. He quotes Clemens, and a parallel passage from Justin, on pp. 193, 194 n 3.

[2] Isa liii. 10.

[3] On the Jewish sacrificial system, cf. Rashdall, pp. 66 ff.

ficial term. What Aramaic word He used, if He was then speaking in Aramaic, we do not know for certain ; but the Greek word translated ' ransom ' is employed in the Septuagint to render three different Hebrew words, all of which mean the legal equivalent for a life otherwise forfeit to slavery (under God or man) or to death (sometimes also for land or produce legally owed). A verb formed from one of these three occurs very frequently in the Jewish sacrificial laws, with the meaning ' to make propitiation.' [1] And when we remember that our Lord is referring, not to a money-price, but to a *life* to be given up, and when we read His saying in the light of the words at the Supper about His covenant-blood to be poured out, the natural inference is that, in speaking of a ' ransom,' He is borrowing a figure from the national sacrificial system.

We shall return later to the significance of this use of sacrificial language ; but it is desirable at this point to remind ourselves of two facts :

(1) The Jewish system of animal sacrifices, despite the veneration it has acquired from our traditional respect for all that is sanctioned in Scripture, and despite the sympathy that is undoubtedly due to the religious beliefs of all men, however divergent from our own, must nevertheless be characterized as an utterly primitive and savage practice founded on a tragic misconception of the Divine Nature and Will ; and it must be recognized and frankly described in its true character as a preliminary to any satisfactory discussion of Jewish and early Christian ideas of atonement.

(2) The sacrificial terms used both by the Old Testament poet [2] and by Jesus were not used with the

[1] Cf. Rashdall, pp. 32 f n.
[2] Cf. R. Mackintosh, p. 36.

desire to give exact doctrine, but merely in order to provide a passing illustration or metaphor, drawn from a field of experience familiar to the hearers, such as would help in giving utterance to a thought that was new and revolutionary in the history of human morals.[1] This metaphorical or illustrative use of sacrificial language in our prime sources of information should warn us of the danger of treating the similar language used by the earliest and ablest interpreters of these sources as statements of doctrinal truth, strictly and literally meant.[2]

(*d*) THE POINT OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ISAIAH LIII. AND THE GOSPELS.—Alongside of the close and striking parallels between the poems of the Suffering Servant and the teaching and experience of Jesus, one important point of difference stands out. In the old poems there is no suggestion that God Himself shares, in any real way, in the sufferings of His Servant. He sits above, secure, helping His messenger on earth in the face of human opposition, encouraging him, prizing him, and approving of him, and finally vindicating and glorifying him[3]; but He is not thought of as Himself sharing the messenger's burden and agony. And indeed, in spite of the many strong anthropomorphisms used by the Hebrew writers, the idea of God as suffering for man's sake is by no means very prominent in the Old Testament. One of the most popular texts expressing it, "In all their affliction He was afflicted," is unfortunately found, on careful

[1] On the ease with which sacrificial language would be used in this connection, see Rashdall, pp. 69 f: "In such a world it was almost inevitable that any new remedy for sin should be treated and spoken of as a new kind of sacrifice," and so on.

[2] On the impossibility of interpreting 'ransom' in Mc x. 45 literally, see Weinel, p. 226. He thinks Jesus was drawing a general parallel between Himself and the victim slain at the first Passover.

[3] Isa xlii. 1, xlix. 1–6, l. 7, 9, lii. 13, liii. 10, 12.

examination, to be a mistranslation of Hebrew words meaning something totally different.[1] Hosea[2] and other prophets occasionally approach this idea; but it is never made quite explicit, still less central. In the teaching of Jesus, however, there is enough to justify us in saying that it was an integral part of His Gospel to represent God as shouldering burdens and enduring suffering in consequence of His loving determination to work ceaselessly for the salvation of men. This is seen most clearly in the parables of the Lost Coin, the Lost Sheep, and the Prodigal Son. In the last, the suffering of the father is plainly suggested, if not actually mentioned. In the two former, no indication is given as to whether the seeker of the lost is meant to represent God Himself[3] or Jesus; and this very ambiguity is significant, for it means that, for Jesus, His own troublous toil and God's troublous toil on behalf of wayward men were indistinguishable—a conclusion entirely in keeping with the tacit assumption He seems to make elsewhere that His own attitude to men and God's attitude to them were the same. That being so, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that Jesus regarded all He suffered at men's hands as being suffered also by God. In any case, this was the belief established in the minds of His most thoughtful followers. "God was in Christ," says Paul, "reconciling the world to Himself."[4] According to the

[1] Isa lxiii. 9. The translation of the corrected text runs: (8) "He became their deliverer (9) in all their distress. Not a messenger, nor an angel, (but) His own Presence delivered them," etc.

[2] xi. 1, 4, 8 f.

[3] So Weinel, p. 153.

[4] 2 Cor v. 19. The Greek of Acts xx. 28, where (according to the English Versions) Paul speaks of God having purchased His Church "with his own blood," is ambiguous, and permits the alternative rendering "with the blood of His own" (i.e. His own Son)—another possibly significant ambiguity.

oldest and best manuscript of the letter of Clemens of Rome (95 A.D.), the author reminds his readers that the sufferings of God used to be habitually before their eyes.[1] Ignatius (about 115 A.D.), in his highly coloured style, speaks of certain Christians as "rekindled into life by the blood of God."[2] Of course, when it had once been accepted as an orthodox belief, to be taken for granted, that Jesus *was* God, it was natural enough to speak of His sufferings as God's own sufferings. So, for example, the mediæval poet represents a rascal as confessing: "Goddes peyne and his passioun, ful selde thynke I thereon."[3] But it would be short-sighted to regard this sense of the Divine suffering as simply an inevitable deduction from the ascription (made on other grounds) of divinity to Jesus. It is true that the thought of the supreme God submitting to suffering is one from which many Christian minds have shrunk, as it seems to cut right across our notion of that infinitude which naturally appears to us to be one of the least mistakable of the Divine attributes.[4] It is also true that the efforts which succeeding generations of

[1] Clem. *Ep. to Cor.* ii. 1. The later MSS have 'Christ' instead of 'God'; but it is easier to understand how the name 'Christ' came to be substituted for 'God' than vice versa.

[2] Ignat. *Ep. to Ephes.* i. 1.

[3] Langland, *Piers Plowman*, Passus V. l. 409. Rashdall observes (p. 451) that such language has become distasteful to modern Christians.

[4] Tertullianus argues against Praxeas for the impassibility of God (the cry of dereliction on the Cross "was uttered that it might show that the God who thus left the Son, while handing over the man in him to death, was impassible"), and accuses him of having "crucified the Father" (*Adv. Prax.* 1 and 30). Cf. W. E. Channing, *Works*, i. p. 546: "What can be plainer, than that God cannot, in any sense, be a sufferer, or bear a penalty in the room of his creatures?" etc. Per contra, A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking*, p. 158 ("In a uniquely complete and intimate sense God was in the suffering of Jesus"); Gibson 8 ("Above all, we have expressed in Jesus Christ the fact that there is in God, though sinless, a suffering caused by man's sin," etc.).

Christian thinkers have made to affirm the union of Jesus with God the Father, without affirming that God the Father was born of a human mother and died on a wooden cross, cannot be said to have led as yet to any philosophically successful doctrine of the Divine nature. At the same time, the orthodox Christian doctrine of the Person of Jesus Christ—whatever philosophical difficulties it may involve—has the merit of having preserved the belief (half-consciously as it were, for the explicit statement of it was often avoided) that in some real sense it was God Himself who bore the cost of Calvary.

## III

## *THE CROSS OF JESUS IN CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE*

(*a*) EXPLANATION IN REGARD TO TERMS USED.—If, in the light of all this, we wish now to state what has been, so far as we can know it, man's normal experience of the Cross of Jesus, apart from the sacrificial and other metaphorical language in which he has endeavoured to set it forth, we must not be deterred by the risk of expressing the thoughts and feelings of many in language very different from what they themselves would have chosen.

We may, for instance, begin by describing the Christian experience of the Cross as a revelation[1]; but if we do so, it is necessary to forestall the objection that this is an inadequate figure under which to portray our Lord's work. Jesus, it will be said, certainly reveals God, but He does much more. The answer to the objection is, that, when we are speaking of deep spiritual experiences, *none* of the language at our disposal is really adequate: we are driven to use metaphorical or semi-metaphorical expressions, which confessedly fall short of sufficiency. Let it be understood, then, that when we speak of Jesus' work as a

[1] "But how did the suffering of the innocent avail to save the guilty? It saved them by opening their eyes" (W. E. Orchard, quoted in *The Crusader*, May 28, 1920, p. 9).

'revelation' of God, we do not thereby imply that no real personal intercourse between God and man takes place. The fact is that, whether we speak of a revelation made to us, or a word of God spoken to us, or a gift of God graciously bestowed upon us, or a work done by God for us or in us, or an approach of God towards us, we are simply making use of one or other of a number of more or less inadequate metaphors, in order to express that which is really beyond expression. There was, therefore, no need for Newman to have drawn the distinction he did between Grace and that

> higher gift than grace, . . .
> God's presence and His very self
> And essence all divine.

In these matters we are in a region beyond the limits of our spatially conditioned thoughts and feeble analogies. We cannot have the Grace of God without God Himself; we cannot have a revelation of Him without His very presence; we cannot hear His voice without receiving His gift. Let us, therefore, understand by revelation a manifest action on God's part to us-ward, vouching for His presence, witnessing to and expressing His love, and calling for a grateful and serious response on our part.

(*b*) The Cross convinces us of the Being and Goodness of God.—Firstly, then, the Cross has given men a revelation of God. "He that has seen me has seen the Father" does not mean that Jesus is personally identical with the Father—a statement which Christian orthodoxy would strenuously deny—but that he who has, in a receptive and teachable spirit, contemplated Jesus, has—in and through that act—enjoyed a vision of God, as one gains a view of the

starry heavens through the transparent glass of a window. Truly, then, does our poet say of Jesus :

> Who thee beheld thy imag'd Father saw.

Meditation on the Cross of Christ is the most cogent of all arguments for the existence of God. It lifts us above the realm of logic with its evidences and proofs, and convinces us, by virtue of a sublimer dialectic, that there is One with whom we have to do, whose character is that ascribed by Jesus to the Father in Heaven—nay more, one whose character resembles that of Jesus Himself. Whatever intellectual problems may be left over, we ask for no further evidence of the goodness and love of God.

(*c*) THE CROSS CONVINCES US OF SIN AND OF THE CONSEQUENT SUFFERING OF GOD.—The second fact that is borne in upon us is our own imperfection and contemptible unworthiness as compared with Jesus—in plain words, our sin. Dense, indeed, would be the heart and mind of him who could rise up from before the figure of " Jesus Christ openly set forth crucified " with a feeling of self-satisfaction undimmed by any sense of shame. " The ordinary impulses stand out more clearly discerned, and men see more surely what sin is. That figure upon the cross gives the measure of the natural man, shows him of what he is capable ; and that has meant the education of mankind." [1] And hard on the heels of this sense of shame comes the discovery that, just as the sin of the enemies of Jesus necessitated the crucifixion, not simply of an innocent man, but of one whose prayer for their pardon

[1] Glover, in *CHN*, p. 168. Cf. Wade (*NTH*, pp. 667 f) : " It was the presence in Christ's death of a *moral* quality appealing to all in whom the germs of moral life exist, that enabled His death on the Cross to avail for the removal of sin, through the repentance and change of heart which it brings about in the sinner," etc.

evinced His love for them, so our sin means the infliction of pain upon One who loves us to the uttermost. What sin did to Jesus, it does to God.

> Men say that Thou
> Didst die for me, for such as *me*,
> Patient of ill, and death, and scorn,
> And that my sin was as a thorn
> Among the thorns that girt Thy brow,
> Wounding Thy soul.[1]

"The cross . . . became in itself the source of 'conviction of sin'; men by it saw further into the love of God and into the meaning of their own sin than ever before."[2] The process is not unlike that experienced by a growing youth who, on emerging from the thoughtlessness of his earlier years, comes to realize, with something of a shock, what an unworthy response he has made to the love of his father or mother, now perhaps beyond the reach of earthly compensation at his hands. All the most humbling

[1] Tennyson, *Supposed Confessions of a Second-rate Sensitive Mind*. Cf. Richard Crashaw's lines in *The Flaming Heart*:

> For in love's feild was never found
> A nobler weapon then a Wound.
> Love's passives are his activ'st part.
> The wounded is the wounding heart. . . .
> Live here, great Heart; and love and dy and kill.
> And bleed and wound; and yeild and conquer still.

Some modern writers are disposed to repudiate the view of God based on this experience. E.g. R. Mackintosh, p. 74 ("The God who is all gentleness and grief, imploring sin-stained men to be at peace with Him, is not the God of the Bible, or of nature, or of fact; nor is He the God and Father of Jesus Christ"), and a writer in *The Expositor*, April 1924, p. 319 (describing Wilson's book as "a 'pacifist' pamphlet, which seems to regard God as a magnified human individual who is content to let people see that they have hurt him by their sins, but who will not react against any violation of the moral order"). These utterances do scant justice to our Lord's parable of the Lost Sheep, or even to His conduct in submitting, as God's representative, to death.

[2] Glover, *JEM*, p. 76.

and most ennobling thoughts that can come to a wilful or thankless child when at last he 'discovers' his parent's real goodness, are reproduced in those whom the Cross awakens.

(*d*) THE CROSS INDUCES REPENTANCE, PARDON, AND MORAL VIGOUR.—Then follows that self-surrender to the Divine love, that turn-over of the whole life-purpose, which we know, in the language of tradition, as repentance,[1] and its consequent harmony, which we truly regard as the Divine pardon, which others have called, more forensically, justification, and which is perhaps best defined as the formation or re-formation of fellowship with God.[2] "No religious exercise," wrote Wesselus, a fifteenth-century Christian, "contributes more to a true justification, than frequent meditation on our Lord's passion, with a commemoration of the same."[3] Nor does the experience stop at the establishment of true peace of mind. It acts as the most potent of those rebuffs "that bid us neither

[1] On what ground does W. H. Moberly (in *Foundations*, p. 308) say: "Penitence that is not vicarious, the unsupported penitence of the sinner himself, is never complete or wholehearted"? That the Cross of Jesus should induce penitence in the onlooker is so simple a thought that it is very surprising to find Harnack saying, with reference to the words of Clemens of Rome, quoted above, p. 28 n 1: "This transformation of 'the forgiveness of sins' into 'the grace of repentance' shows clearly that the special value put upon the death of Christ for the procuring of salvation is for Clemens merely a matter of tradition; for it is meaningless to derive the grace of repentance from the blood of Christ" (*Dogmengeschichte* (1888) vol. i. p. 171 n; Eng. trans. vol. i. p. 201).

[2] Rashdall (pp. 81 f, 205) is much concerned to prove that the application of scriptural prophecy, i.e. Isa liii., to Jesus' death must have been prior to the experience of forgiveness as the ground for connecting that experience with that death. But some experience of penitence and pardon through the sufferings of God's Servant was itself prior to the very composition of Isa liii.; and the same may surely be said of the early Christian adoption of Isa liii. as a prophetic description of Jesus' death, in spite of the scantiness and vagueness of early Christian statements of the experience (yet see the words of Clemens referred to in the last note).

[3] Milner, *History of the Church of Christ*, vol. iv. p. 234.

sit nor stand, but go." Jesus becomes not only the "author and perfecter of our faith" in God,[1] but the One who inspires and enables us to pursue the highest moral ideals. It was Sloth who, according to Langland, thought full seldom of "God's pain and His passion." Human love and service draw their chief driving-power from that constraining love of God which is visible in the constraining love of Jesus.[2]

(*e*) SUMMARY.—Summing up, we may say that "in Christ, and in Christ's death, . . . there has been made possible a new relation with God. It is not possible for us to say how the death of Christ affects God. It is possible for us to say [that] where the man has been reached by it, a new relation with God has been evident in life and thought and character, in the creation and education of a new conscience, in a far higher way, in a far deeper way, than was possible when Christ was the example taken simply." [3] Or we may put it even more simply and clearly in the words of Elizabeth Charles' hymn :

> Gazing thus, our sin we see,
> Learn Thy love while gazing thus—
> Sin, which laid the Cross on Thee,
> Love, which bore the Cross for us.
>
> Here we learn to serve and give,
> And, rejoicing, self deny ;
> Here we gather love to live,
> Here we gather faith to die.

[1] "Once I prayed, out of the depth of my heart : 'now, Almighty One, give me faith!' . . . A powerful impulse drew my soul to the Cross, on which Jesus perished. Thus my soul was near to Him who became Man and died on the Cross, and in that moment I knew what faith is. 'This is faith!' I cried, and sprang up, almost as in terror. For such emotions as these, all words fail us" (Goethe, quoted by Bayard Taylor in his translation of *Faust*, p. 174).

[2] Carter, pp. 15 f.

[3] Glover, in *CHN*, p. 172.

It has become the custom, among certain circles of Christians, animated by a desire to be as un-Roman as possible, or to have as little to do with the external apparatus of religion as possible, to decry concentration on the death of Jesus, and in particular to condemn the use of the crucifix, on the plea that we ought to turn our thoughts to the living, not to the dead, Christ, that we ought to hold Him, not in our hands, but in our hearts,[1] and so forth. "The fall from that [early Christian] faith," it has been said,[2] "and all the corruptions of its abortive practice, may be summed up briefly in the habitual contemplation of Christ's *death* instead of His *life*, and the substitution of His past sufferings for our present duty." It may readily be granted that we ought to think of the life and teachings, as well as of the death, of Jesus, of His triumph over the grave, as well as of His descent into it, and also that much harm has been done by Christians thinking of the atonement in an unethical way. But that is not to say that meditation on the passion, assisted by some visible representation of it, is an unwise or unnecessary proceeding. The Christian who has no use for Calvary, whether in his ethics, his theology, or his devotions, is missing the straightest and plainest path to that ultimate reality which is the heart of God.

[1] "The earl of Kent, observing that in her devotions she made frequent use of the crucifix, could not forbear reproving her, exhorting her to have Christ in her heart, not in her hand. She replied . . . that it was difficult to hold such an object in her hand, without feeling her heart touched for the sufferings of Him whom it represented" (Goldsmith, on the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, in *Half Hours of English History*, vol ii. p. 523).

[2] By an author quoted but unnamed by Farrar, *Lives of the Fathers*, vol i. p. 20.

## IV

## *SOME THEOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS*

Having thus probed, as far as we can, the meaning of Jesus Himself, and having analysed the experience of those who have found moral and spiritual renewal through His Cross, we may next advance at least a little way in working out the theological implications of the conclusion we have so far reached. We may take first the question :

(*a*) IN WHAT SENSE WAS JESUS' DEATH 'NECESSARY' FOR HUMAN SALVATION?[1]—Older views of the atonement, which regarded Jesus' death as being literally, and not simply metaphorically, an atoning sacrifice offered as a satisfaction in order to make the forgiveness of men by God possible, were obliged to answer the question, 'Was the death of Jesus a necessary condition for God forgiving man?' with a most definite and unmistakable affirmative. The implication of such an answer would seem to be that God could never have forgiven sin before Jesus died ; and mediæval writers like Dante and Thomas à Kempis said so in so many words.[2] But how is this inference to be reconciled

[1] The demand that " moral-influence " theories of the atonement shall explain why Christ's death was necessary appears and reappears in R. Mackintosh's book (pp. 16–18, 146–148, 298 f).

[2] In *Paradiso*, xxxii. 8 f, speaking of John the Baptist, Dante says :

> He who endured the desert, and the pains
> Of martyrdom, and, for two years, of hell,
> Yet still continued holy.

(Cary's note on 'two years' is " the time that elapsed between the death of the Baptist and his redemption by the death of Christ "). Cf.

with the testimony of the pre-Christian Psalm ciii., in which we find a consciousness of Divine pardon as clear and full as we have it in any book of Christian devotion: "As far as the East is from the West, so far has He removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pities his children, so the Lord pities them that fear Him"? And how are we to reconcile it with the numerous allusions made by Jesus to God's forgiveness of men as a frequent and indeed almost normal experience, based on the coincidence of Divine magnanimity and human repentance, and apparently independent of and unrelated to the death of Jesus or to any other atoning sacrifice? Is it possible to make the dictating of the Lord's Prayer (with its daily petition for pardon), or the utterance of the Parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, the Prodigal Son, and the Pharisee and the Tax-collector, intelligible, if it be supposed that Jesus regarded God's forgiveness of human sin as not taking place until after His own death? Answers to these questions are so obvious that they do not need to be explicitly given in detail;[1] and they drive us to the conclusion that the death of Jesus was not necessary—in the abstract or in an absolute way—as a sine quâ non of the forgiveness of sins. For God was just as loving and forgiving before our Lord's death as He was after it; and genuine repentance (the one condition of being forgiven by Him) was by no means impossible or non-existent

*Imitation of Christ*, III xviii. 2 ("They who then were just and meet to be saved, could not enter into the heavenly kingdom, before Thy Passion, and the due satisfaction of Thy holy Death"). We may quote as a modern parallel the words of Moulsdale, p. 14: "Our prayers are heard by virtue of our membership in Christ, and only so far as they are united with the heavenly intercession of our great High Priest and his sacrifice."

[1] Gibson declares (p. 12): "God has always been ready to forgive and this is as true of pre-Christian as of post-Christian days."

before that death.[1] At the same time, what is possible in the abstract, and even in a few cases real, may, in the absence of a certain condition, be so rare, and, in the presence of that condition, so frequent, that we may without impropriety speak of the condition in question as being a de facto necessity for the attainment of the object which it so strikingly facilitates. Such is the hardness of human hearts that, in actual experience, it has proved needful for the special appeal uttered through the death of Jesus to be made to men, in order that they might be moved to do that which in the abstract they were, by virtue of their having been made in the image of God, capable of doing without that appeal.

> Tho' truths in manhood darkly join,
> Deep-seated in our mystic frame,
> We yield all blessing to the name
> Of Him that made them current coin.[2]

The suggestion, however, may be hazarded that, when efforts are made to preserve belief in the necessity of Jesus' actual death as a condition of forgiveness, the truth that is really meant to be defended is that for-

[1] Gibson (pp. 14–16) defends the necessity of Jesus' death on the two grounds that without it man would not feel *assured* of his salvation (Ps ciii. answers this), and that manifestation in time and space are as necessary to Divine as to human life (a somewhat abstruse philosophical argument which, if true, would have necessitated the occurrence of the crucifixion at the same time as the Creation).

[2] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, xxxvi. We may compare the similar argument of Henry Rogers in *The Eclipse of Faith* (6th edn, 1855, p. 258) about the necessity of the Bible: "The most that merely human culture can promise, even under the most favourable circumstances (witness ancient Greece!), is that men, in some few favoured instances, may possibly attain those truths which it may be admitted are congenial to the soul, and easily recognised when once propounded, but which, in fact, few men, by nature's sole teaching, ever do clearly attain. It is infinitely important that the path, dimly explored by sages alone, should be thrown open to mankind."

giveness is impossible without the eternal presence in the Divine nature of that factor of which the self-sacrifice of Jesus is the grand manifestation within the limits of time and on the field of human history.[1]

(*b*) In what sense did Jesus die for *all* Men?—It is noteworthy that the 'Servant' of Isa liii. is described as succeeding not with all, but with "many." "*Many* were appalled at him . . . he will startle *many* nations . . . by his knowledge will My Servant make *many* righteous . . . he carried (away the) sin of *many*."[2] There is a clear quotation of this poem in Daniel (xii. 3), where it is said of the good men who rise from the dead: "They that make the many righteous (will shine) like the stars for ever and ever." When we consider how familiar Jesus was both with Isa liii. and with Daniel, it is hard to resist the impression that His words about giving His life as a ransom for *many*, and about His blood being poured out on behalf of *many*, were deliberate and conscious borrowings from the Old Testament passages just quoted. What, then, is the significance of the limitation thus expressed? The simplest explanation is that, in all three cases, it is anticipated that some men will refuse to give any moral response to the appeal made to them, and that consequently the stimulus of the appeal does them no good, and thus not *all*, but only *many*, are benefited by it. If we confine our survey to human

[1] Quoth Christ, "Ere seas had shore, or earth
Foundations laid,
My Cross was made!"
(Laurence Housman, *The Mystery of the Incarnation.*)

"There was a cross in the heart of God before there was one planted on the green hill outside of Jerusalem. And now that the cross of wood has been taken down, the one in the heart of God abides, and it will remain so long as there is one sinful soul for whom to suffer" (Dinsmore, quoted by Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 322).

[2] Isa lii. 14 f, liii. 11 f.

life within its earthly limits, the truth of this, in point of fact, is obvious. The death of Jesus does not benefit those who will make no moral response to it.[1] Christian thought, however, in magnifying and objectifying the work of the Master, soon lost sight of this important condition, and began to speak of "all men" or "the world" as being saved by Christ. Thus, the author of the Pastoral Epistles describes God as the "Saviour of all men, *specially of them that believe*," and, in quoting Jesus' own ransom-saying, obliterates the qualification made by the word "many," and says that He "gave himself a ransom for all."[2] Of course it is true—and we are uplifted and encouraged by the thought—that Jesus is the Saviour of all men *potentially*, seeing that His exhibition and mediation of the Divine love and patience is now available for all, and all may, if they will, accept and profit by it. But it is necessary to point out the distinction between the potential and the actual in His universal Saviourhood,[3] as some later Christian interpreters have darkened counsel by interpreting New Testament allusions to the former as if they were affirmations of the latter, and thus have arrived at theories of a "cosmic salvation" (irrespective of individual acceptance) or of an inclusive humanity in Jesus or of a 'representative' endurance of suffering on His part[4]—theories which

[1] Gibson, pp. 9, 12, 14.

[2] 1 Tim iv. 10, ii. 6. Swete says, on the ransom-saying, Mc x. 45 (*St. Mark*, p. 241): "Jerome's comment 'non dixit . . . "pro omnibus," sed "pro multis," id est, pro his qui credere voluerint' is quite unwarranted." Why?

[3] This distinction was one of the characteristic doctrines of Moyse Amyraut, the French 'Reformed' theologian of the seventeenth century (Hastings' *ERE*, vol i. p. 405b), and, of course, of his senior, the famous Arminius (*op. cit.* 809b).

[4] E.g. Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 332, and Mozley, pp. 213, 217. Cf. the sane criticisms of Rashdall, pp. 258, 423–426, and Wade, *NTH*, pp. 620, 653, 656.

introduce a needless unreality into the data of our problem.

(*c*) Does Forgiveness abolish the Consequences of Sin?—Another implicate of the older and more purely objective views of the atonement was that forgiveness so annulled the sin forgiven as to obliterate its consequences. But the stubborn logic of experience warns us that all hope of undoing the past is fanciful, that whatsoever a man sows that shall he also reap.

> The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,
> Moves on: nor all thy Piety nor Wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
> Nor all thy Tears wash out a Word of it.

Furthermore, the modern recovery of the psychological approach to the whole problem has led us to see that exemption from punishment and abolition of consequences, even were these things possible, are not indispensable conditions of a true forgiveness. From our experience of human pardon, we know that a man who is genuinely reconciled to someone he has wronged will naturally *not* desire to escape his punishment, but will rather be eager to shoulder, so far as it is possible, the burdensome consequences of his wrong-doing. So, too, the man forgiven by God "moves over to God's point of view. He no longer wishes to escape the consequences of his actions. If the Father of Jesus makes a law, the man will now wish at all costs to maintain it, he will co-operate to the extent of wishing to bear the penalty that his Father thinks helpful to him and to others. But is this forgiveness? If the penalty is still to be borne? But what *is* the penalty, when once there is reconciliation? Is it a punishment if you *wish* it? Let Him do what He will! The crop sown has to be reaped; but Another will help in the

reaping, and it is something to work along with such a Friend even in so painful and humiliating a task." [1] What forgiveness and reconciliation do is not, as used to be thought, to secure for us a reprieve from our due share of the pains of hell, but to forestall the incurrence of future penalties by breaking the power of sinful habit in the present, and so preventing further sin.

(*d*) WHAT DIFFERENCE DID JESUS' DEATH MAKE TO GOD?—With this question we are getting nearer to the centre of our problem. If we were engaged in constructing a philosophy of salvation rather than in tentatively reviewing the materials for such a philosophy, we should at this point be faced with the task of laying the bedrock foundations for the whole structure. There are many who would perhaps find little to deny in the foregoing pages, but would yet feel that, until the question now before us has been satisfactorily answered, the heart of the problem has not been reached. In any case, the nearer we come to the fundamentals, the more cautiously we must tread. We have already [2] quoted Dr. Glover's downright statement: "It is not possible for us to say how the death of Christ affects God." It is, however, possible to specify, with a due measure of diffidence in so difficult an inquiry, one or two corollaries that would be involved if the foregoing conclusions were accepted. No theory of the atonement can be accepted which requires us to believe that God was, on His own part, more loving and forgiving after Jesus had died than He was before, or which represents Jesus' death as 'propitiating' or 'appeasing' Him.[3] These latter terms

[1] Glover, *JEM*, pp. 87 f.

[2] See above, p. 39.

[3] Cf. the words of Arthur Lyttleton in *Lux Mundi*, p. 211 ("The reconciliation to be effected is not merely the reconciliation of man to God by the change wrought in man's rebellious nature, but it

are drawn from the old and now utterly discredited Hebrew view of God as a capricious and irascible Being, whose wrath could be bought off by slaying and burning animals on His altar. As has been explained above, sacrificial language was used at the first in a metaphorical way to assist expression; but such havoc has been wrought on the Christian conception of God by the treatment of terms like 'propitiation'

is also the propitiation of God Himself, whose wrath unappeased and whose justice unsatisfied are the barriers thrown across the sinner's path to restoration"), and the more elaborate explanation of the late Principal Forsyth, given in *The Expositor*, April 1923, p. 297 ("God so loved, in such a way, that in Grace He gave for man a propitiation to His own holiness. Christ died because God required it; and God required it not simply as a lever to lift man but as a function of the self-respect of the Absolute, for His personal satisfaction and the hallowing of His eternal name. And who outside of His Godhead could do that? My point throughout is that the profounder reading of the gospels discovers this to be the latent mind of Jesus. It is the propitiatory element, the element that gives its due from among sinners to the personal holiness of God—that is the distinctive thing in the love of God as declared, preached, brought home by the whole Christ"). But Dr. Forsyth's entire theory is based on an unreal antithesis between holiness and love. What unholiness is there—or what unrighteousness, for Dr. Forsyth equates the terms—that is not a breach of the Law of Love? (Cf. Maltby, p. 16, on the unreality of the antithesis).

A recent Anglo-Catholic explanation runs as follows. "The Eucharist is well described as a memorial before God of the death of Christ, a representative sacrifice. It is a propitiation in this sense, that it makes God propitious to those who contritely participate in offering it by placing before him his beloved Son, who, by dying for us once upon the cross, has become for every succeeding generation the sufficient propitiation for sin.

> See, Father, thy beloved Son,
> Whom here we now present to thee;
> The all-sufficient sacrifice,
> The sinner's one and only plea."—(Moulsdale, p. 10.)

The psychological, moral, and theological unrealities introduced here are obvious. In what sense can we "place before him his beloved Son"? Does God need to be reminded by us of Jesus' death? And if He does, how does the Eucharist provide a better reminder than prayer would? And how or why does this reminder 'make God propitious' if He was not so before? The personal Fatherhood of God has evaporated in the process of attempting to rationalize a piece of sacramental magic.

as literally instead of metaphorically true that it would almost be better if they were banished finally and for ever from the vocabulary of Christian doctrine.[1] Whatever deep truths may still lie hidden in the saving death of Jesus, those ideas are not worthily expressed by the perpetuation of language that bears stamped upon its forehead the mark of its origin in the primitive ignorance of a savage antiquity.[2] The ideas for which such terms stand are neither required by man's experience of the Cross,[3] nor admissible in face of Jesus' doctrine of God. The death of Jesus is the exhibition, under certain historical conditions, of the suffering which sin occasions to a loving and holy God. It enables God to forgive sin only in so far as it brings us to our senses and elicits from us the dutiful response of repentance and the desire for forgiveness. The assertion that this is not adequate may be true in the sense that further questions still remain to be asked; but the inadequacy is not mended by the simple introduction of the biblical idea of a vicarious atoning sacrifice.[4] Whatever effect the occurrence of an event

[1] "Some of the greatest errors in theology have come from the literal and dogmatic interpretation of what was intended to be poetical" (Headlam, *LTJC*, p. 249).

[2] "The sacrificial system of Judaism was not so much anticipatory of the coming of Christ, as it was reminiscent of the primitive rites of Canaan. To seek for the satisfying meaning of the atonement around the blood-stained altars of the Old Testament, is to him" (the evolutionist) "to go astray" (W. P. Merrill in *The Expositor*, April 1923, p. 264). Cf. Wade, *NTH*, p. 666.

[3] Rashdall has pointed out (pp. 148 f) that early Christian writers, although they use sacrificial formulæ about the death of Christ, yet usually fall back into subjective, or at any rate ethical, language when they come to explain their experience. He gives an interesting example from Origenes on p. 285.

[4] "The metaphor of sacrifice is indeed found in the New Testament. It is used because it is a popular way of speech, because it is an easy symbol; and yet when one tries to define the idea of sacrifice and realizes the essence of Jesus' revelation of God, the more alien the two things become. The metaphor fails, the symbol will not do. It confuses the issues" (Glover, *JEM*, p. 65; cf.

Theological Library
BETHEL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL MINNESOTA

in history, by which God's love for men and His moral righteousness were revealed with unique clearness,[1] has upon Him, that effect did the death of Jesus have upon Him. Such self-expression must have satisfied God.[2] Such self-expression must have been beyond measure costly.[3] Further than that we dare not venture.

(*e*) WHERE DOES THE ULTIMATE MYSTERY LIE?—It will be plain to the candid reader that, in the theological positions taken up in the preceding paragraphs, no attempt is made to belittle the tragic seriousness of sin, the reality of the experience of salvation, the objectivity of God's part in that salvation, and the element of mystery that veils its fundamental nature. Liberal and modernist thinkers are often charged with

Weinel, pp. 284 f). W. H. Moberly, availing himself of a primitive Arabic idea of sacrifice as the communion of all members of the tribe in the blood or life-force of the animal totem-deity (a view popularized by W. Robertson Smith in his *Religion of the Semites*), concludes "that the traditional Oriental metaphor would seem, after all, to harmonize with modern thought" (*Foundations*, p. 306 n). The difficulty about this conclusion is that such a conception of the meaning of sacrifice, even if it had been originally held by the primitive Hebrews, is not represented consciously or explicitly in the Old Testament at all.

Sanday and Headlam, in their great commentary on *Romans* (pp. 91–94) offer a detailed study and a temperate defence of the New Testament doctrine of Christ's death as a propitiatory sacrifice, but they modestly forego the attempt at an explanation. "We believe that the Holy Spirit spoke through these writers, and that it was His Will that we should use this word (propitiation). But it is a word which we must leave it to Him to interpret. We drop our plummet into the depth, but the line attached to it is too short, and it does not touch the bottom. The awful processes of the Divine Mind we cannot fathom. Sufficient for us to know that through the virtue of the One Sacrifice our sacrifices are accepted, that the barrier which Sin places between us and God is removed, and that there is a 'sprinkling' which makes us free to approach the throne of grace" (p. 94).

[1] "In what sense can the Death of Christ be said to demonstrate the righteousness of God? It demonstrates it by showing the impossibility of simply passing over sin," etc. (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 89).

[2] Cf. W. N. Clarke, pp. 348 f.

[3] Cf. H. R. Mackintosh in *The Expositor*, July 1922, pp. 69–74.

neglecting important elements of this kind, and the charge is doubtless in some cases well grounded; but it does not follow that, if only the neglect is repaired, we shall be led back to the old position, or even appreciably nearer to it. If it be an easy task to convict some 'modernist' statements of shallowness, it is equally easy to convict some venerable and even some recent 'orthodox' statements of gross misrepresentation of the true facts.

At the same time—in maintaining opposition to certain traditional words and thoughts—it must always be borne in mind that even the most repellent of them probably stood for some element of truth which it is important to conserve—all the more important because our opposition to the language in which it comes to us is apt to obscure it from us. For example, "if modern thought denies any validity to the belief that sin incurs the wrath of God, it has overshot the mark. . . . The use of 'anger' or 'wrath' in connection with God is only objectionable, in so far as it suggests an arbitrary, private, and personal emotion."[1] If we have been at all in danger of forgetting that sin provokes in a loving God a reaction of unspeakably grave significance, by all means let us take precautions against forgetting it in future. Only, if the use of the word 'wrath' is a bequest from times when men did not know God as we know Him, and if it is to mean something very different in God from what it means in men, then either we must find another term, or we must take refuge in an explanatory periphrasis.

[1] W. H. Moberly in *Foundations*, p. 279. Cf. H. R. Mackintosh in *The Expositor*, Nov. 1920, p. 375: "The individual who has thus far failed to discover value in an article of the hereditary creed is bound to ask himself which is more probable: that his denial is mistaken, or that the Church in all generations has seen something where in reality there is nothing to see."

The fact is, that our difficulties over terms and phrases arise from the very nature of the subject.

> The faith, the vigour, bold to dwell
> On doubts that drive the coward back,
> And keen thro' wordy snares to track
> Suggestion to her inmost cell,

find themselves plunging at every step into a deeper and deeper abyss of inscrutable mystery. "Whether we will or no, *omnia abeunt in mysterium;* the only question is as to the ultimate nature of the mystery." [1] Suggestion's 'inmost cell'—to revert to Tennyson's figure—is beyond our range. Something is no doubt gained by removing the mystery from places where no mystery needs to be. But if it be asked, Why are the natures of God and man so constituted that, when man sins, that sin always involves God in suffering, and unless that suffering is lovingly and patiently borne, unless God is willing to bear in His own person the enormous and incalculable cost of forgiving sin, the sin cannot be overcome and the man forgiven and reconciled?, we can give no answer. Forgiveness is effected only at tremendous cost to God. Why? There lies the final and insoluble mystery.[2] It was in feeling after that mystery, in endeavouring to find expression for it, that the New Testament writers were driven to use sacrificial language, as crutches wherewith to steady their dizzy minds. Here, for instance,

[1] Mozley, p. 205. For the mystery with which the death of Jesus was regarded by the early Greek Fathers, cf. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, vol iii. pp. 305 f (Eng. Trans.).

[2] "The emphasis is on the *cost* of man's redemption. We need not press the metaphor yet a step further by asking . . . to whom the ransom or price was paid. It was required by that ultimate necessity which has made the whole course of things what it has been; but this necessity is far beyond our powers to grasp or gauge" (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p 86).

we have the inscrutable truth behind the apparently repellent words : " Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." And it is in attempting the same task that so many modern scholars almost inevitably fail to satisfy.[1] The love of God is a vast immeasurable ocean ; and it is no wonder that our soundings produce some puzzling results, when we " sink the string of thought into the fathomless." In face of this ultimate mystery, when all has been said that we can say to clear our thoughts as we approach it, we can but bow our heads in reverent and grateful awe, sure, despite our perplexity, that we are not far from the heart of the truth so long as we are " persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor spirit-rulers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing, will be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

[1] Rashdall speaks with impatience (p. 439) of " those who repudiate with indignation all that strikes most modern minds as immoral or irrational in the older schemes, and then re-introduce them in attenuated or surreptitious forms, and condemn or scornfully disparage each and every intelligible alternative." It would be interesting to know whether he would have regarded the present essay as falling under that displeasing category.

## V

## *THE SAVIOURHOOD OF THE DISCIPLE* [1]

(*a*) The Firstborn among Many Brothers.—It would probably be admitted by thinkers of all schools that, as in the Person, so in the work, of our Lord there are both unique elements and elements common to Himself and His followers. Opinions, however, begin to diverge when we try to characterize the unique and to mark it off from the common.[2] It would be a help in such an investigation if we were to begin with as exact a study as possible of the historical and psychological data, and build up our metaphysic on the results of that study, rather than to take certain doctrinal positions as already guaranteed by Christian tradition, and then attempt to make the data fit them. Thus we must not start with assuming that Jesus was the pre-existent Son of God, the Second Person of the Trinity, because, even if that belief be true, it was not a belief with which the Church started, but an inference gradually drawn from prior experiences: and as those

[1] We may compare the parallel idea in Zoroastrianism: "The worldly corporeal existence and human affairs are no enemies of piety, but pure elements and duties, the diligent fulfilment of which formally constitutes each Mazdayasnian a fellow-worker with Ormazd, a helper, saviour . . . and . . . 'a renewer' of humanity and of the world. These functions he discharges in company with the great heroes," etc. (N. Söderblom, in Hastings' *ERE*, vol i. p. 209b).

[2] Draw, if thou canst, the mystic line
Severing rightly his from thine,
Which is human, which divine.
(Emerson, *Worship*.)

experiences were prior, not only in time, but in immediacy and directness, to the inferences, it is to them, and not to the inferences, that we must in the first place go back, if they are to have for us the revolutionary meaning which they had for the first generations of Christians. The right assumed by Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel and Athanasios and other framers of Christian doctrine to be allowed a free hand in the philosophical manipulation of the history of Jesus and of their own experience of Him, belongs as truly to Christians of every period. We are, indeed, under obligation to treat the beliefs of all men with sympathy and reverence, in particular the beliefs of 'the great of old,' and to accept them humbly and thankfully when they are true; but we are no more under an obligation to adopt the theological framework and doctrinal conclusions of Paul because they were Paul's, than the author of the Fourth Gospel or any other Christian thinker of the first century would have admitted himself to be.

Taking, then, the New Testament witness to Jesus in the broad, we can easily trace two tendencies operative within it. Firstly, there was the advancing process towards an ever higher and more transcendental Christology. Jesus is first the beloved Teacher, Friend, and Master; then He is the Messiah, the 'man approved of God,' the chosen Servant; then the future Judge; then the pre-existent Son; then the one who, being in the form of God, might conceivably have snatched at equality with Him; and finally the co-eternal Logos who was in the beginning with God. Secondly, there is the oft-recurring consciousness of Jesus' similarity to, and solidarity with, His followers. "Behold my mother and my brothers! for whoever does the will of God,

that (person) is my brother or sister or mother." [1] "The pupil is not above his teacher, nor the slave above his master. It is enough for the pupil that he become like his teacher, and the slave like his master." [2] "He that believes in me, the works that I do he also will do, and greater things than these will he do." [3] Paul speaks of Christians being destined to be conformed to the image of the Son, "in order that He might be (the) firstborn among many brothers." [4] In another passage he tells how he aspires "to know Him and the power of His resurrection and (the) fellowship of His sufferings, being moulded (in)to (the likeness of) His death, if somehow I may attain to the resurrection from (among) the dead." [5] "Now I rejoice," he says, "in the sufferings (I undergo) for your sakes, and I (thus) fill up in my flesh the deficiencies of the afflictions of Christ for the sake of His body, which is the Church." [6] "Ye take a share," says Peter to his readers, "in the sufferings of Christ." [7] "He learned obedience," says the author of 'Hebrews' (referring to Jesus), "by the things He suffered." "For it was seemly in Him, for Whose sake and by Whose means (are) all things, (in) bringing

[1] Mc iii. 34 f ||s. That Jesus more or less habitually spoke of His disciples as His brothers appears from Mt xxv. 40, xxviii. 10; Jn xx. 17.

[2] Mt x. 24 f. The parallel in Lc vi. 40 runs: "The pupil is not above his teacher; but every (pupil) perfectly trained will be like his teacher."

[3] Jn xiv. 12. [4] Rom viii. 29. On viii. 17, see below, p. 71 n 1.

[5] Phil iii. 10 f.

[6] Col i. 24. On the interpretation, Gibson, pp. 10 f.

[7] 1 Pet iv. 13. Dr. Bigg (*Intern. Crit. Comm.* on 1 Pet, p. 176) comments: "'Partake in suffering' is a phrase which seems to imply that the Christian not only suffers like Christ, but that his sufferings produce in their degree the same result as Christ's." Similarly on ii. 21 (p. 145) he remarks: "the disciple's cross 'draws' as does that of his Master; the sacrifice is the same in its [own particular] degree, and so are the results." For his comments on iii. 17 f and iv. 8, see below, pp. 71 f. Cf. Weinel, p. 467, where Clem. *Ep. to Cor.* xvi., Ignat. *Ep. to Ephes.* x. 3, and Polycarp *Ep.* viii. are quoted as parallels.

many sons to glory, to make the pioneer of their salvation perfect by means of sufferings. For He who makes holy and they that are made holy all (come) from one (Father): and for this reason He is not ashamed to call them brothers. . . . Wherefore He had to be made like His brothers in all things, in order that He might become a merciful and trustworthy high-priest in the things of God." [1]

Now, without making any attempt to set aside the former of these two tendencies, we cannot help recognizing the fact that the last-quoted passages—whatever they may imply as to the origin of Jesus' *Person*—do strongly suggest in regard to His *Work* that its uniqueness consists rather in its primacy and potency than in any vital difference of kind from that of His followers. Jesus does first and does best what others are to do under His inspiration.[2] And the truth of this is obvious in regard to much of His ministry. Teaching, preaching, healing, praying, winning men, enduring persecution—these and many other functions are obviously thought of as common to our Lord and His disciples. "It is the way the Master went: Should not the Servant tread it still?" Is there not, therefore, at least a prima facie case for conjecturing that the saving and redeeming power exercised so potently by Jesus through His death is—in lesser measure, of course, but in the same manner—exercised by His martyred disciples? [3]

[1] Hebs v. 8, ii. 10 f, 17.

[2] Of the word translated 'pioneer,' in the passage from Hebrews, Weinel says (p. 549): "*ἀρχηγὸς* . . . often means the ancestor of a tribe, the hero with whom a new course of life (Lebensreihe) begins."

[3] Rev. W. P. Merrill writes in *The Expositor* for April 1923, p. 271: "Dr. Ernest D. Burton once said to me that so far as he knew there is not a reference to the cross in the entire New Testament which does not view it as meant for the disciple as truly as for the Master." A somewhat similar view is expressed by Wade, *NTH*, pp. 621, 677 n 2.

Four clear reasons may be given for holding this view.

(*b*) THE WORK OF THE SUFFERING SERVANT OF ISAIAH LIII. IS NOT UNIQUE IN KIND.—There is nothing in Isaiah liii. which forbids us to generalize its fundamental message. The Servant, whose mission and character are simply those of a true prophet of God, wins his triumph *because* his soul passes through travail and is poured out unto death.[1] Does it not follow that every true prophet who meets with such opposition may expect, not only a similar martyrdom, but a similar redemptive triumph. If those critics are right who believe that the Servant is meant to be Israel, or the godly nucleus in Israel, personified, then the functions ascribed to him must have been to the poet's mind capable of being carried out by a considerable number of individuals; but even if the Servant is a single historical character, there is nothing in his portrait and story that might not be reproduced in many another life.

(*c*) JESUS EXPECTED HIS DISCIPLES TO DIE WITH HIM, AND FOR A LIKE PURPOSE.—It is commonly assumed that Jesus, in taking His place as 'the Teacher and the Master,'[2] gave His disciples to understand that He was ploughing an absolutely lonely furrow; that He expected to do a work utterly different in kind from what they were to do; that, however much there might be in His example for them to copy closely, yet in the saving death that was to crown His life none of them must presume to share. The contrary, however, was clearly the case. We find Jesus not only warning His followers that they must face opposition and persecution as He had to face it; but we find Him saying: "If anyone wishes to

[1] Isa liii. 11 f. [2] Jn xiii. 13.

come after me, let him deny himself, and lift up his cross, and follow me." [1] "Whoever does not take up his cross, and follow after me, is not worthy of me." [2] "The cup that I drink shall ye drink, and with the baptism wherewith I am baptized shall ye be baptized."[3] It was surely no part of Jesus' plan that the disciples should all forsake Him in Gethsemane, and flee.[4] Yet what would have been their obvious fate had they stood by Him? And there is yet another saying which seems to imply that Jesus regarded His disciples' martyrdom as effecting a precisely similar result to His own. According to Mark and Matthew it was spoken immediately after Jesus had promised Jacob and John that they should share His cup and His baptism; and if the setting of it in these Gospels is trustworthy, it further strengthens the probability of the implication we have alluded to. After explaining with emphasis that greatness and rank among the disciples would depend, not, as among the Gentiles, on coercive authority, but upon humility and mutual service, Jesus clinches His injunction by referring to Himself as their example in this: "Whoever wishes to become great among you, shall be your *servant*, and whoever wishes to become first among you shall

[1] Mt xvi. 24 = Mc viii. 34 = Lc ix. 23. Luke adds 'daily' after 'cross'; but the absence of the word from Mt and Mc strongly suggests that it was not spoken by Jesus, but inserted by Luke to adapt the saying more perfectly to Christian devotional reading. This conclusion is confirmed by the next passage quoted above.

[2] Mt x. 38. Lc (xiv. 27) says "cannot be my disciple."

[3] Mc x. 39; cf Mt xx. 23. What the 'cup' of Jesus meant is made clear by His prayer in Gethsemane; and for His baptism in this sense, see Lc xii. 50. For the sentiment, cf Jn xi. 16.

[4] The statement to the contrary in Jn xviii. 8 is found only in that Gospel, where it is inserted in order to demonstrate the fulfilment of a certain prophecy supposed to have been uttered by Jesus (9), and where there are other unhistorical features (e.g. 6). It is also out of keeping with Mc xiv. 27, 38 = Mt xxvi. 31, 41, unless the flight is to be understood as a proceeding especially sanctioned by Jesus at the last moment.

be slave of all ; *for* [Mt has ' *just as* '] the Son of Man came, not to be *served*, but to *serve*, and to give His life (as) a ransom for many." [1] Surely it is here suggested that, as the Master is an example to the disciples in *serving*, so is He also an example to them in dying as a ransom for many ; that is to say, the disciples, besides sharing in the Master's toil of healing and teaching and enduring persecution, also share in His far-reaching redemptive work. What Jesus Himself expected to do by His death, He expected His disciples also to do—each one in his own way and measure—by their deaths, viz. bring other men to God. " Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven." [2] Here we have the quintessence of the Master's guidance for His disciples. But what beyond this and its implications was He Himself doing throughout His whole ministry and in His death ? What beyond this *can* be done for men ?

(*d*) " THE BLOOD OF THE MARTYRS IS THE SEED OF THE CHURCH," I.E. IT HAS REDEMPTIVE POWER. —The best comment on the foregoing passages is the repeated testimony of early Christian writers that the more the Christians were persecuted, the more they increased in numbers.[3] Martyrdom under persecution invariably attracted new converts, i.e. it brought sinners to God. " Every confessor and martyr was a missionary ; he not merely confirmed the faith of those who were already won, but also enlisted new members by his testimony and his death. Over and over again this result is noted in

[1] Mc x. 43–45 ||. See above, p. 27 n 2. [2] Mt v. 16.

[3] A few references to the Fathers must suffice. See *Ep. to Diognetos*, vi. 9 ; Justinus, *Dialogue*, 110 ; Clemens of Alex., *Stromateis*, VI xviii. 167 ; Tertullianus, *Apologeticus*, 50 (" The more often we are mown down by you, the more numerous we become ; the blood of the Christians is seed "), *Ad Scapulam*, 5 ; Origenes, *De Principiis*, IV i. 2.

the Acts of the martyrs. . . . While they lay in prison, while they stood before the judge, on the road to execution, and by means of the execution itself, they won people for the faith." [1] Through the trouble of their souls the martyrs made many righteous. Because they poured out their lives to death, they divided the spoil with the strong. They let their light so shine that men who saw it glorified God. They gave their lives as a ransom for many. The First Epistle of John explicitly states: "(It is) by this (that) we know (what) love (means, namely, by the fact) that He laid down His life for our sakes: and we (also) ought to lay down (our) lives for the sake of (our) brothers." [2] Ignatius begs in his *Epistle to the Romans* 3: "Grant me nothing more than to be poured out as a libation to God, while there is still an altar ready." Clemens of Alexandria says of Jesus: "For each one of us He laid down His life —the equivalent (in value—*τὴν ἀνταξίαν*) of the whole (world). This (same sacrifice—*ταύτην*) He demands from us on behalf of one another." [4] It is, however, Origenes who expresses most fully the idea that the sufferings of the martyrs exercise a redemptive power like that of Jesus. Thus, in his *Commentary on John*, he enlarges in a rational way on the influence of martyrdom on the minds of the persecutors.[5] In the *Exhortation to Martyrdom* he says: "As those who attended at the altar (erected) according to the law of Moses

[1] Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity* (Eng. Trans.), vol i. p. 367. Cf. Glover (*CR*, p. 165) à propos of martyrdom: "It was the death of Jesus over again—the last word that carried conviction with it."

[2] 1 Jn iii. 16. Cf. Rashdall, pp. 181 f. [3] ii. 2; Rashdall, p. 193.

[4] Clem. *Quis Dives Salv.*? 37; Rashdall, pp. 222 f. Clemens tells us (*op. cit.* 42; also Euseb. *H.E.* III xxiii. 17) that the Apostle John, in endeavouring to reclaim a young convert who had lapsed into a life of brigandage, said: "If need be, I will willingly endure (to die) thy death, as the Lord (endured) the (death He died) for our sakes, I will give my life for thee."

[5] *Comm. Joann.* vi. 54 (Brooke i. p. 174); Rashdall, p. 263 n.

were thought to administer to them forgiveness of sins by means of the blood of bulls and goats, so 'the souls of those who have been beheaded' on account of the testimony (they bore) to Jesus, attending to good purpose at the altar in heaven, administer forgiveness of sins to those who pray. And besides that, we know that, just as Jesus Christ, the High Priest, offered himself up (as) a sacrifice, so the priests, whose High Priest he is, offer up themselves (as) a sacrifice.[1] . . . Perhaps also, just as we have been purchased 'by the precious blood' of Jesus . . . so 'by the precious blood' of the martyrs will some be purchased, for (the martyrs) themselves will be more exalted than those who have become righteous, but have not been martyrs. For it is reasonable that death by martyrdom should be called exaltation in a special sense, as (is) clear from the (words): 'If I am exalted from the earth, I will draw all men to myself.'"[2] And again, in a later work: "Let us see how He (Jesus) with His sons—the apostles, that is, and martyrs—takes away the sins of the saints."[3] And further on: "If the lamb which is given (up) for the purification of the people is referred to the person of our Lord and Saviour, it seems consistent that the other animals also, which are assigned to the same purificatory uses, ought similarly to be referred to some persons who confer something of purification on the human race"; and more to the same effect.[4] In his great apologia for Christianity, *Contra Celsum*, he says of Christ: "On account of

[1] *Exhort. to Martyrdom*, 30 (Lommatzsch, xx. 274 f).
[2] *op. cit.* 50 (Lomm. xx. 314 f).
[3] *Hom. on Numbs.*, x. 2 (Lomm. x. 96).
[4] *Hom. on Numbs.*, xxiv. 1 (Lomm. x. 292 f). Some MSS insert in the last sentence *per meritum sanguinis Christi*—probably a gloss. Rashdall (p. 263) quotes a few other passages from Origenes on the same general lines. Newman (*Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, p. 375) alludes approvingly to the theory.

Him there have come to be many Christs in the world, (namely those) who, like Him, have loved righteousness and hated iniquity"[1]—a sentiment repeated a generation later by Methodios[2] (about 285 A.D.). The fact that the pagan converted by witnessing a martyrdom might have described the process in terms very different from those employed in the argument of this essay does not alter the fact that the martyr's self-sacrifice was the means whereby the pagan was brought to accept God's gift of pardon.

(*e*) The Divine Power of Human Goodness and Self-sacrifice generally.

i. *Human self-sacrifice redeems.*—For close modern analogies to these early Christian conversions through the appeal of martyrdom we should have to turn to the history of Christian missions. But we do not need to limit this 'fellowship in the sufferings of Christ' to martyrdom in its narrower sense. The martyr's death is but the supreme exhibition of what we are all more or less familiar with as Christian patience and self-sacrifice. All such loving and costly service administers to others in some measure that same inward cleansing that is administered by the death of the martyrs, and pre-eminently by the death of Jesus. For the stimulus which results in a definite and conscious conversion is precisely the same kind of stimulus as that which, operating in many varying and lesser degrees of efficacy, produces a wholesome sense of unworthiness and a heightened moral standard. When Joan of Arc was burnt at Rouen, an English soldier was heard to mutter, as the

[1] Orig. *Contra Cels.* vi. 79; Rashdall, p. 258.

[2] *Conviv. Virg.* viii. 8 ("... so that each one of the saints, by partaking of Christ, might be born a Christ ... as though those who have been baptized ... had become Christs"); Rashdall, pp. 292 f.

crowd broke up: "We are lost; we have burnt a saint!" A story is told of an officer in Napoleon's army who, during the retreat from Moscow, woke one morning to find that he had been kept warm during the night because a group of common soldiers, now frozen to death, had thrown their own cloaks over him. The experience moved him solemnly to resolve that he would thenceforward never commit a mean or unworthy action. "Death," wrote the late Walter Rauschenbusch, "has a strange power over the human imagination and memory. . . . If a significant death is added to a brave and self-sacrificing life, the effect is great." [1]

ii. *Human goodness redeems.*—An appeal may confidently be made from the orthodox theologian to human moral experience in support of the belief that all human goodness stimulates and helps those who witness it or learn of it to be good themselves. The fact is of importance, as a denial of it has been made an important link in certain doctrinal arguments, and a neglect of it is a very widespread characteristic of

[1] *A Theology for the Social Gospel*, p. 270. "Benjamin Kidd states the law of Darwin thus: 'If A can kill B before B can kill A, then the race becomes more and more a race of A's, possessing A's qualities.' But as life mounts higher, it becomes increasingly clear that another law is at work, which may be stated thus: 'If A will lay down his life for B, then the spirit of A takes possession of B, and lives on in him, and comes to dominate the race.' There is atonement at work" (W. P. Merrill, in *The Expositor*, April 1923, pp. 268 f).

Compare the beautiful lines of Walter C. Smith, in his poem *Olrig Grange* (*Works*, p. 86):

> And all through life I see a Cross,
> Where sons of God yield up their breath:
> There is no gain except by loss,
> There is no life except by death,
> And no full vision but by Faith,
> Nor glory but by bearing shame,
> Nor justice but by taking blame;
> And that Eternal Passion saith,
> 'Be emptied of glory and right and name.'

ancient and modern theories. Thus Mr. W. H. Moberly quotes as a true and important statement the words written by his father in *Atonement and Personality:* "If He" (i.e. Jesus) "were not God, the fact that He was good . . . would be a fact of no more moment to me than the fact that Samson was strong, or Solomon wise, or St. Paul intrepid, or St. John beloved. They are, but I am not; and that is the difference between them and me; and that is all." [1] But is this really so? Are we not better men for learning about the wisdom of Solomon, the bravery of Paul, the lovableness of John? I challenge any Christian to read the Apology of Sokrates, and then say that he has derived from it no moral uplift. If it be said that the stimulus one receives from meditating on the goodness of God's saints is infinitesimally smaller than that communicated to us by Jesus, I grant it, observing only that, in things where there is no unit of measurement, words that imply a quantitative as well as a comparative judgment can at best be only very rough approximations. The point, however, is not that the stimulus is as strong in one case as in another, but that it is *of the same kind.* If, again, it be urged, as by Dr. Moberly, that the moral appeal made by the lives of the saints is often feeble and futile, the answer is that the Grace of God can always be resisted, and that the appeal even of Jesus Himself often fails to make us morally what we would be.

> What keeps a spirit wholly true
> To that ideal which he bears?
> What record? Not the sinless years
> That breathed beneath the Syrian blue.

The goodness of Jesus no more *compels* me to be good than does the goodness of Francis; but I can no more

[1] *Foundations*, p. 315.

say that the goodness of Francis is a fact of no moment to me, that he was good and I am not, and that that is all there is in it, than I can say the same of the goodness of Jesus. Our argument involves our meeting Dr. Moberly's statement with a direct negative, and consequently in challenging all the inferences based upon it.

iii. *Human goodness and self-sacrifice redeem by revealing God.*—When, therefore, we say that human goodness and human self-sacrifice redeem, we do not think of redemption, just as the traditionalist does not usually think of it, as something that redeems a man whether he will or no, something that saves him even though he make no response to it. We think rather of redemption as depending upon man's willing reaction to the gracious personal influence of God. Man is not compelled to make that reaction, and in this life many men do not make it. Human goodness and self-sacrifice, then, redeem simply in the sense that through them God reveals to His children His own true nature, i.e. His goodness and love. Human goodness, as Jesus Himself assured us, is an index pointing to the Divine goodness. Human self-sacrifice awakens us to the Divine sorrow for sin.[1]

> For chiefly in the oppressed Good Man's face
> The Great Invisible (by symbols seen)
> Shines with peculiar and concentred light,
> When all of Self regardless the scourged Saint
> Mourns for th' oppressor.[2]

Every brave and unselfish action brings a God-ward pressure to bear on the onlookers. All the love shown by others strengthens our faith in the Divine love : we

[1] " The vision of holiness produces in man the sense of his own sin " (Miss Jourdain in *The Hibbert Journal*, July 1920, p. 765).

[2] Coleridge, *Religious Musings*.

see *their* good works, and glorify *our Father in Heaven.*[1]

iv. *Human goodness and self-sacrifice reveal God because they actually* are *God's goodness and self-sacrifice.* —The ground for this redemptive character of all human goodness and self-sacrifice lies, as we have said, in their being a revelation of God. They are this, for the simple reason that they *are* His own goodness and self-sacrifice. For

> . . . every virtue we possess,
> And every conquest won,
> And every thought of holiness,
> Are His alone.

We are face to face with a great mystery here. There is an all-inclusiveness about the being and doings of God which, for all our well-grounded belief in His personality and transcendence, yet withholds us from speaking of Him as if He were altogether a distinct individual

[1] Compare the interesting confession of Mr. W. M. Horton in his article on 'Reasons for believing in God' in *The Journal of Religion*, November 1923, pp. 599–601: "Now what do I mean by saying that I met God in Drinkwater's 'Lincoln'? . . . I got a double impression of moral nobility in the highest degree, and of irresistible power. In the first place, Lincoln humbled me as the ideal always humbles the actual; his human figure, with its homely qualities and obvious limitations, became, as it were, translucent, and through it shone a pure and unwavering light, the light of the ideal, making me long unutterably to be like him—and unlike myself. . . . 'Yes'—and here I took a terrific leap, from an impersonal moral order to an anthropomorphic deity—'there is at the heart of things a spirit like that of Lincoln, a personality like his.' Thus did the primitive savage reason, and thus, I admit it, I reasoned." "All human love, all human self-sacrifice is in its way and degree a revelation of God" (Rashdall, p. 449). Professor A. E. Taylor, therefore, is the victim of a false antithesis on a very important issue when he says (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1924, p. 602) that, on the Adoptionist theory of the Person of Christ (viz. that Christ was a man who attained to divinity by His supreme goodness), "the Cross may still bear witness to the love of the man Christ for His fellows, but it ceases to bear any witness to the character of God. The whole specific character of the Christian religion is lost when the death on Calvary is turned into a mere piece of altruistic sacrifice on the part of a very excellent man."

like one of ourselves.[1] "We cannot think of Him as sundered from our personality as we [are] from each other."[2] "As every object that we see in nature is seen only by its reflecting rays of the sun, so every exhibition of goodness which we behold in creatures, is nothing but the reflection of the perfections of him who is the Father of lights."[3] And His goodness of necessity involves Him in suffering.[4] "In all our afflictions He is afflicted"; and the fact that the words are a mistranslation[5] does not make them any less true. Not a sparrow falls to the ground without Him; He feels it when the little bird's neck is wrung. As the *Yearly Epistle* of the Society of Friends for 1922 tells us: "Each pang in the agony of the starving Russian child the Father feels as his own."[6] The loving goodness of those about us *is* the loving goodness of God. "I am saved by the self-sacrifice of God now, mediated to me through parents and friends, through all who risk their lives that my life might be better; and Calvary is the supreme, the unique proof and

[1] So, for instance, Sanday and Headlam in *Romans*, p. 197: "The one thing which is characteristic of personality is distinctness from all other personalities; and this must hold good even of the relation of man to God."

[2] A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking*, p. 49. Wordsworth (*Excursion*, bk iv.) speaks to God of

the blessed Spirits,
Which thou includest, as the sea her waves.

[3] Francis Wayland, *Elements of Moral Science*, p. 141. Cf. Nettleship, quoted in *Foundations*, p. 321: "Everyone who even for moments knows what it is to lose himself in others is doing what God does eternally."

[4] A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking*, p. 59: "the love that does not suffer with the suffering of the loved, and still more at the sinning of the loved, is a counterfeit the more hateful for its high denomination." Cf. Gibson, pp. 5–9, 12 f.

[5] See above, p. 31. Cf. L. Dougall in *The Hibbert Journal*, January 1921, p. 306: "That God suffers in all the evil that the process of development includes is the doctrine of the Cross."

[6] "If you let a child starve you are letting God starve" (G. Bernard Shaw, quoted in *Contemporary Review*, May 1923, p. 627).

forthsetting of that great principle which saves me to-day."[1] The identification of the sufferings of God with the sufferings of His children gives us the answer to those who insist that the death of Jesus must have been more than a mere martyrdom. Of course it must, since there is no such thing as a mere martyrdom, if by that you mean something in which God does not suffer fully as much anguish as the martyr himself. You cannot see the martyrdom of a man without seeing at the same time the martyrdom of God.[2]

(*f*) THE NATURE OF THE UNIQUENESS OF JESUS' WORK.—But the question will, of course, be pressed: Is there, then, nothing unique about the death of Jesus which distinguishes it from the other human martyrdoms

[1] W. P. Merrill, in *The Expositor*, April 1923, pp. 270 f.

> Who liv'st in every living thing,
> And all things are thy script and chart,
> Who rid'st upon the eagle's wing,
> And yearnest in the human heart.
> (A. Lampman, *Peccavi, Domine.*)

Dr. Chas. Harris (in *Creeds or No Creeds?* pp. 146–148, 342 f) presses emphatically the distinction between God knowing man's experience from outside and knowing it as His own—in other words, between His immanence in man and His incarnation in Christ. His fear doubtless is lest, if this distinction be lost sight of, Catholic orthodoxy shall be deserted for Pantheism. But not all arguments against Pantheism are of equal value; some, if accepted, would disprove also both His omnipresence and His immanence. We could accept Dr. Harris' argument, if God were to be thought of as being but another individual like each one of us (his analogies are drawn chiefly from cases of *human* sympathy); but God is not just another individual. There is a mysterious infinity about His transcendent and immanent personality which puts our finite mathematical categories out of court.

[2] "What doth God say (if one may speak of God after the manner of men) when a malefactor suffers the anguish due to his crime? He says, *My head and my limbs are pained.* And if He so speaks of the suffering even of the guilty, what must He utter when the righteous is condemned" (The Jewish Mishna, *De Synedriis*, vi. 5, quoted by A. T. Innes, *Trial of Jesus Christ*, p. 19; but the passage is loosely quoted, and its relevance in the original somewhat dubious).

On the general question of the passibility and impassibility of God as a Christian doctrine, cf. Rashdall, pp. 437 f, 443–454; C. Harris, *Creeds or No Creeds?* p. 257.

we know? The answer is—in part at least—this: Jesus is unique as the first and the best. His moral purity and grandeur give His life and passion an unrivalled transparency as a medium through which we see into the heart of God, or (to use an alternative metaphor) through which we receive and grasp the proffered love of God. He wields a unique potency in stirring our conscience and confirming our faith. He is unique, too, as a pioneer, who makes impossibilities possible by doing them for the first time: He is the first-born among many brothers. There will doubtless be readers who at this point will exclaim: "Yes: but He is more, and He does more." The present writer has no wish to deny it, though for his own part he knows not how to point to any specific aspect of the work of Jesus which is different *in kind* from the work His disciples were called upon by Him to do. At any rate, unless the argument of the preceding pages is entirely on wrong lines, it is quite clear that many of the time-honoured ways of describing the uniqueness of Jesus' work prove on examination to be untenable. Thus His death does not, as was supposed, increase the forgiving love of God any more than do the deaths of the martyrs. Nor does His death save us any more than theirs do, unless there is a moral response on our part. If we be reminded that a little above we recognized the existence of an ultimate and insoluble mystery touching the costliness which God's love and goodness impart to His forgiveness, we would reply that that mystery faces us just as impenetrably when we dwell upon the lower ministry of the martyr as when we turn to the supreme ministry of the martyr's Lord. Certainly we are, in this whole discussion, handling ineffable and sublime realities, the ultimate roots of which far surpass the reach of human wisdom. But,

granting that we are justified in systemizing our thought on the matter as far as we can, then to say that there is "something more" which we have not yet done justice to or taken account of is not really to establish an objection, unless some definite content can be given to that "something." Until this can be done, the possibility of incompleteness does not invalidate positive conclusions otherwise well-grounded, still less, of course, does it justify the retention of other views which, without clarifying the unresolved element, contradict and stultify the conclusions arrived at, and possibly also the data on which they are built.

(*g*) THE ATTAINMENT OF THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD.—When, therefore, Jesus bade His disciples to let their light shine before others so that the latter should be led to glorify their Father in heaven, He was calling on them to take up under His guidance the same rôle of redeemer and saviour which He had taken up Himself.[1] It is a dangerous rôle; but physical collapse under human opposition, so far from being a real set-back to the redemptive work, was believed by Jesus to be, and has actually proved to be, the occasion of its capital success and decisive victory. "He died as the innocent sin-offering, and our innocent sufferings have in their degree a similar value; He brought us near to God, and we may bring others."[2] Now one of

[1] "His life not merely an example for ours, but in its main lines presenting a fixed type or law to which the lives of Christians must conform" (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 204, commenting on Rom viii. 17—"if we suffer with Him," etc.).

[2] Canon Chas. Bigg, in *Internat. Critical Commentary* on 1 Peter, p. 161. Dr. Bigg is commenting on 1 Peter iii. 17 f, and asks at an earlier point: "How far are we to suppose the parallelism between the Passion of Christ and that of the Christian to extend?" On 1 Pet iv. 8 he says (p. 173): "The love of Christ covers sins . . .; and love of the brethren, flowing as it does from the love of Christ, may be regarded as a kind of secondary atonement. Brother becomes a Christ to brother, and, in so far as he renews the great

the most familiar forms under which Jesus visualized His post-mortal triumph was the resurrection from the dead; and the real core of the early Christian view of our Lord's resurrection was not that His physical body had been resuscitated (though that belief was certainly accepted), but that, after and despite physical death, He survived triumphant and strong, and that His defeat had given place to a real and glorious victory. It was in this victorious and heavenly activity—loving and eternal, and therefore invincible—unhampered by the limitations and failures that came with the conditions of bodily life, that Paul aspired to share; for this at bottom was what he meant by attaining to the resurrection from the dead.[1] Such attainment, such participation in the Lord's triumph, he regarded as impossible without an equally real participation in the Lord's sufferings, without being moulded into the likeness of His death, without filling up in his own flesh the deficiencies of the afflictions of Christ. And inasmuch as these afflictions which conditioned Christ's triumph were incurred in the plain performance of His life's duty, so the victorious passion of the Christian will be met, if at all, on the same road. The important task, therefore, still awaits us of investigating more closely the moral conditions which brought about Jesus' death, and the ethical meaning of those conditions for His followers.

Sacrifice, becomes a partaker in its effects and a channel through which the effects are made operative for others." See also above, p. 56.

[1] Phil iii. 10 f.

## VI

## *THE ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS*

(*a*) The need of discovering the Moral Ground for Jesus' Acceptance of Death.—Most theories of the atonement suffer through failure to establish a sufficiently close relation between the religious and eternal significance of the death of Jesus on the one hand, and on the other the human or moral conditions under which that death actually took place as an historical event. But unless the steps Jesus took in approaching and accepting death can be shown to be essentially and vitally connected, as moral conduct of a certain kind, with the deep Divine message of which the Cross is thought to tell,[1] that message is bound to lose the greater part of its clarity and therefore of its force. Such relationship unestablished, the saving death of Jesus becomes, despite the cogency of all our doctrines about sin and the necessary conditions of its being forgiven, an arbitrary enigma, a mysterious and inscrutable 'plan of salvation,' determined on by God for reasons known only to Himself, and therefore totally beyond the scope of human understanding. It cannot indeed be denied that, for thousands of Christians, the love of God has been brought home to them by

[1] The connection here called for and sought after is virtually the same as that repeatedly insisted upon by Rashdall (pp. 356 n 3, 362, 440–442, 454 f), viz. that between Jesus' life-work as teacher, healer, etc., and His atoning death. "The death came to Him as the direct and necessary consequence of His faithfulness to His Messianic calling, of a life devoted to the doing of God's will and the service of His fellow-men" (p. 441).

means of a message and a doctrine of this enigmatic type. The Divine gift of redemption and cleansing is theirs; but their theory of how it has been made available for them is a theory of pure magic. In their religious beliefs, men for the most part prefer the marvellous to the moral [1]; and God's ways of reaching us are so manifold that very imperfect theories are often found to exist alongside of true spirituality and goodness of life.[2] But all this does not excuse the retention of a single imperfect theory *wherever means are available for improving it.* No debt of reverence owed to the true sanctity of thousands of evangelical Christians of the past justifies us in resting satisfied with their view of the death of Jesus, in so far as they thought of it as a piece of Divinely sanctioned magic, as remote in its nature from the laws of human morality as were those Old-Testament sacrifices with which they loved to compare and contrast it.[3] In contradistinction to this attitude, the mind of the modern Christian will compel him to endeavour to understand the why and wherefore of Jesus' death, at least as far as he can, along the lines of that human morality which Jesus Himself preached and practised. As Neander said: "There must be a right conception of Christ's self-sacrifice *as a moral act*, . . . in order to

[1] Cf. the remarks of Professor F. C. Burkitt, quoted in *The Hibbert Journal*, January 1922, pp. 204 f.

[2] "The influence of Christ . . . is so overwhelming and so life-giving that it has been able largely to neutralize the effects of the demoralizing theories which have too often been taught in His name" (Rashdall, p. 420).

[3] Kautzsch says of the authors of the Priestly Code (the chief body of sacrificial law in the Old Testament): "In the mind of P there could be no other answer to the question as to the efficacy of sacrifice, but simply this: God has connected the accomplishment of atonement with the obedient discharge of the sacrificial prescriptions" (Hastings' *Dict. of the Bible*, vol. v. p. 721a; cf. Rashdall, pp. 102 f). Much 'evangelical' teaching about the death of Jesus is of the same kind.

[get] any just *doctrinal* view of his sufferings." [1] Unless Jesus can be thought of, not as carrying out a Divinely-ordained programme entirely peculiar to Himself, but as doing something which it would have been morally right for any servant of God to do in the circumstances, His death will remain so complete a mystery as to lose most of its power of appealing to men to-day.

(*b*) JESUS ACCEPTED DEATH BECAUSE HE BELIEVED THAT LOVE INVOLVED NON-RESISTANCE.[2]—We return, then, to the obvious fact that Jesus suffered death as a martyr at the hands of His intransigent fellow-countrymen; and it remains for us to consider carefully the conditions that made that tragic consummation necessary. Now a teacher conscious of a Divine commission, but faced with the unyielding opposition and hostility of the powers that be, has three alternatives to choose from. Either (1) he may withdraw and subside, or (2) he may appeal to force, or (3) he may just go on with his message until conflict culminates in martyrdom. The first of these three was out of the question for Jesus; it would have been unworthy of any brave man. But between the other two, why was it that He rejected the second and chose the third? For though we may not be able fully to understand His plans and views in the last weeks of His life on earth, yet on any showing it was His own act that put Him within the clutches of His enemies; and, when in their hands, He behaved with complete passivity, "like a sheep that is led to the slaughter, and like a ewe that is dumb before her shearers." [3]

[1] *Life of Jesus Christ* (Eng. Trans.), p. 380 (first italics mine).

[2] It may be explained at this point that we use the word non-resistance for the sake of brevity, though dissatisfied with its purely negative form. It stands, of course, for an active and aggressive goodwill, negative only in that it excludes all injurious violence.

[3] I pass by the strange idea of certain scholars, referred to by Cadman (pp. 104 f), that Jesus journeyed to Jerusalem in order to fight and conquer.

Why did He do so? We cannot take refuge in the theory of an inscrutable Divine fiat; nor can we say that He died as a professional 'teacher of truth,' whose peculiar vocation quâ teacher forbids Him to do what would be right for the child and servant of God to do in other circumstances, for He never regarded Himself as having to tread a different path of duty from that of His followers. We are shut up, therefore, to the province of His ethical teaching as the area within which we must seek for our answer. Nor is that answer hard to find. It is becoming increasingly plain to modern scholars that the so-called 'non-resistance' teaching of Jesus was meant by Him to be taken seriously, that it was the original and characteristic element in His ethics,[1] and that all attempts to belittle it or explain it away do violence to His meaning. Here, then, we have a clear and amply sufficient moral and human reason why Jesus chose the way of the Cross. "Conflict, to one who practised non-resistance, meant suffering and death."[2]

[1] Thus the liberal Jew, Mr. C. G. Montefiore, writes: "There are differences as well as agreements" (i.e. between the teaching of Jesus and that of the Rabbis). "These differences partly proceed from the eager, passionate, forthgoing character of the teaching of Jesus. They may be found . . . in the refusal to oppose force by force, in the attitude towards the enemy; in the conception, and in the demand, of seeking out and redeeming the sinner; in certain objections to the doctrines of merit and reward and of tit for tat, and, perhaps, in some aspects of forgiveness and the cure of sin. . . . Certainly, the active attempt to redeem the sinner by service, sympathy, and love was a new thing. It is not in direct relation with the Judaism of the Rabbis or even of later times, though it is being worked into, and applied by, the Judaism of to-day. . . . To these teachings of the Gospels there are some Rabbinic analogies and parallels, though it is fair to say that the *main* Rabbinic teaching is out of relation to them" (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1922, pp. 440–444).

[2] W. H. Moberly, in *Foundations*, p. 306; so, too, Wilson, pp. 32 f. Rashdall (p. 362) says that Jesus faced death from the motive of "love to His Father and to His brethren." Carter (pp. 12 f) and Maltby (pp. 9–14) similarly insist on Jesus' love for man being

(*c*) THIS CONCLUSION IS CONFIRMED BY THE STORY OF THE TEMPTATION, ETC.—Obvious as this point seems, it is worth while dwelling a little on it by reason of the strange shyness of Christian thinkers to grasp it and to draw forth its implications. When we appeal to the non-resistance teaching of the Sermon on the Mount as the inseparable counterpart of our Lord's redeeming death, we are pointed away from that Sermon to the unique rôle of a Divine redeemer, and given other and less lucid reasons for His acceptance of the Cross ; and the attempt is made to dissociate, not only the Master's redemptive work, but also His personal morality, from that of His disciples. But this dissociation is fundamentally mistaken. If any further proof were wanted for the view that, in the mind of the Master, there was one ethic only for Himself and His disciples, and that it was because He believed that love involved non-resistance that He submitted to martyrdom, we have it in the story of His temptation. In that story we are told—if we may so paraphrase its words—that Jesus contemplated obtaining mastery over all the kingdoms of the world, but rejected the scheme because it involved an act of disloyalty to God. There was, of course, only one way in which such power could be obtained, at least within the near future, and that was by means of successful wars. And we may observe that it would be the most natural thing in the world for the idea of waging such wars for the acquirement of empire to suggest itself to one conscious of being the Messiah. It was, indeed, inevitable that

the cause of His death. Rashdall says nothing on his own account about non-resistance, but he quotes (p. 280), under the heading "The death of Christ as a revelation of love," the words of Irenaeus (III xviii. 5) : "The Word of God, which said to us, 'Love your enemies and pray for those who hate you,' did this Himself on the cross, loving the human race to such an extent that He interceded even for those who were killing Him."

Jesus should feel some leanings towards this course.[1] The Old Testament foreshadowed a military conquest over the enemies of God's people. His fellow-countrymen expected the Messiah to lead them on to victory, as Judas Maccabaeus had done; and, indeed, they could hardly have thought of a Messiah who was not also a conqueror. The Galilaeans, among whom He had been brought up, were a patriotic and warlike folk.[2] He Himself had the qualities of personal influence and energy that would have drawn and held a force together. He had the best and noblest of causes – a nation (and that God's Chosen People) bowed beneath the weight of a foreign yoke, with opponents like Kaiaphas and Antipas and Pilate and Tiberius. He would have been fighting for the cause of righteous government and decent conditions of life.[3] We cannot

[1] I gather that Dr. Headlam interprets the Temptation in much the same way: "Under His leadership the armies of Israel would be supreme in the world. . . . It was a natural dream, and He knew that He had the power, but . . . He could only bring it about by using means quite inconsistent with His whole nature. It would mean employing the methods of the world; it would mean the appeal to force; it would mean . . . the submission of the Messiah to the prince of evil" (Headlam, *LTJC*, pp. 293 f. Similarly Weinel, pp. 116 f, and Peake, in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, January 1924, pp. 60, 67). Professor J. W. Falconer, in his article on 'The Temptation' in *The Expositor*, September 1922, pp. 181–185, repudiates this interpretation, because the course would have been imprudent, "to say nothing of the tenderness of heart that would shrink from war." He thinks the temptation was "to work in league with the authorities of the Empire." But working in league with the Empire is not fairly represented by the figure of possessing all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. The objection on the ground of imprudence is answered above in the text, while that based on the bloodiness of war gives the reason why the temptation was rejected, but does not prove that it was not felt.

[2] "That in Galilee . . . for the great mass of the people the kingdom meant the restoration of temporal sovereignty there can be little doubt" (Headlam, *LTJC*, p. 250).

[3] "In the early centuries of our era, under the best government that the Mediterranean broadly has ever known, and in peace, Civilization rested normally on atrocities that to-day are abnormal

say that He was bound to be defeated; that is not certain; and even if it were, it would not explain why He did not try. Religious enthusiasts do not wait for certainty of success before they venture.[1] Everything, in fact, in Jesus' antecedents and surroundings combined to commend to Him the way of war: it was the one way to political power. When, therefore, we are told that He refrained from grasping political power because it involved bowing the knee to Satan, what can we conclude but that the homage to Satan was nothing else than the very means to political power, viz. the appeal to arms? Such an appeal, even in a just cause, Jesus regarded as a violation of the law of brotherly love, and for that reason He declined to make it.[2] The popular explanation of this refusal of political power is that He did not want a *worldly* kingdom, but a spiritual one. This explanation is sound, provided it be rightly understood. If we mean by it that He did not want such control over men as can be gained and kept only by successful war and coercive government, then the explanation is identical with that which has just been given. But if we mean that Jesus assumed to Himself a unique moral law, which confined His interests and activities to the inward and spiritual side of individual and private life, and excluded man's

even in war. That it grew gentler under the Empire, is a proposition hard to maintain in view of the civil wars and religious persecutions of the third century A.D. It had reached a standstill" (T. R. Glover, *JEM*, p. 220).

[1] Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, vol i. p. 201: "der religiöse Enthusiasmus frägt nicht nach der Möglichkeit des Erfolges."

[2] The objection based on Jesus' statement that He came not to bring peace, but a sword (Mt x. 34 ||), is but a superficial difficulty. The context clearly shows Him to be referring to family dissension and persecution incidental to the growth of Christianity. In the Semitic manner, the distinction between purpose and consequence is somewhat blurred.

outward behaviour, both in private life and as a citizen,[1] then to say that He did not desire a wordly kingdom is a grievous misstatement. The fact that He dwelt on the importance of a pure heart and pure motives does not mean that He was unconcerned with the practical and public side of life. Even the Decalogue, in forbidding covetousness, had dealt with inner motives; and Jesus, in His teaching on sex-matters, showed His real concern with outward conduct: and His Messianic consciousness, as well as numerous specific sayings, suffice to prove His keen interest in national and international politics.[2] Jesus did, therefore, desire authority over men; He offered Himself to them as guide both in the inner life and in the outer, both in private and in public matters.[3]

It is needless to continue slaying the slain; but it is perhaps worth while pointing out in passing how much there is that lends support to the view to which we have been led, and even in some measure provides

[1] This view has often been expressed. Thus C. E. Luthardt (*History of Christian Ethics before the Reformation*, Eng. Trans., p. 187) criticizes Tertullianus' strict interpretation of the non-resistance teaching as "the necessary consequence of the standpoint that makes the words of Christ *which refer to the internal attitude of the disposition* directly into a law for the external orders of life" (italics mine).

[2] Lc xii. 54–xiii. 9 show us Jesus warning His fellow-countrymen (probably at Jerusalem) of the folly and danger of any other policy towards Rome than that commended by Himself, viz. love, forgiveness, and non-resistance. The same advice appears in His words about giving tribute to Caesar; and His despair at the Jews' rejection of His counsel, visible in their heightening hostility to Himself, comes out very clearly in Lc xix. 41–44. The subject may be seen dealt with at length by Miss Dougall in *LT*, pp. 120–123, 136–153, and by V. G. Simkhovitch, *Towards the Understanding of Jesus* (New York, Macmillan, 1923).

[3] The true view is well put by Neander (*Life of Christ*, Eng. Trans., p. 344: "By operating upon the heart, he meant to operate upon everything else"), by F. D. Maurice (*Theological Essays*, p. 265: "Has not Christ claimed to be King over both the spirits and bodies of *men?* over their bodies, because over their spirits"), and by Sidgwick (quoted in *Lux Mundi*, p. 355: Christianity "claims to rule the whole man, and leave no part of his life out of the range of its regulating and transforming influence").

independent proof of it. Thus Jesus refuses to be made a king by the Galilaeans, warns His disciples against wanting to wield a coercive authority like that of the Gentiles, declines either to sanction or to take part in the legal punishment of an adulteress, and makes no attempt to avenge the shameful murder of the Baptist or the slaughter of those Galilaeans whose blood Pilate had cruelly mingled with their sacrifices. From this whole body of evidence—precept and conduct alike—we can conclude only that Jesus was convinced that evil cannot be conquered by evil, and that a policy of aggressive love and non-injurious gentleness is the closest human reflex of the inner heart of God and the only radical cure for sin. We conclude also that He incurred death simply because He identified Himself with this policy, and that He invited His followers to face death because He wished them also to identify themselves with it.[1]

(*d*) INSEPARABILITY OF NON-RESISTANCE AND THE CROSS.—We may finally satisfy ourselves of the inseparable connection between non-resistance and the Cross as

[1] A reviewer in *The Expositor*, April 1924, p. 319, criticizing Wilson's *Atonement and Non-resistance*, asks: "How long will it take before it sinks into the minds of some people that when our Lord was speaking of 'smiting on the right cheek,' He was not referring to injuries or attacks, but to insolent behaviour?" and accuses Mr. Wilson of ignoring "facts like these." But even if this watered-down exegesis of the Sermon on the Mount be acceptable (which is more than doubtful), it does not touch the Temptation, or the Lord's non-resisting submission to death, or His demand that His followers should bear their cross, or any other of the details just mentioned—all of them "facts" which are strangely ignored by those who resist the pacifist interpretation.

In *The Expositor* for March 1924, pp. 200–202, Dr. H. T. Andrews lays great stress on Jesus' deliberate choice of the *via dolorosa*: "From the first days of the Temptation in the Wilderness to the final struggle in the garden of Gethsemane, Jesus saw always before His eyes the forking roads," one of these roads being that of political and military enterprise. But he ascribes this choice to the determination of Jesus to die as a vicarious atoning sacrifice for sin, and does not connect it in any way with the *ethic* of the Kingdom.

cause and effect by observing how, if either of them is removed from the life of Jesus, the other is stultified. Let us suppose for a moment that Jesus was not convinced of this policy of non-resistance. His Cross then becomes a total enigma : there is no assignable reason whatever why He should have gone like a sheep to the slaughter. Moreover, apart from the truth of this ethic of non-resistance, our usual admiration for the martyrs, who so often appealed to it, is misplaced ; they would have done better to strike at least a blow or two for freedom and in defence of their threatened women-folk, even if it were but a forlorn hope, like that of the Spartans at Thermopylai. On the other hand, take away the Cross and the martyrdoms, and the non-resistance teaching is deprived of that vindication which the " triumphs " of the Cross have secured for it. True, even so, insight might conceivably persuade us of its promise and potency—as it evidently persuaded Jesus ; but we have no right to decline the help history offers us, and to refuse to make use of the superlative moral and spiritual victories which the Cross and the martyrdoms have won. The blood of the martyrs has proved to be the seed of the Church. The Cross of Jesus, as Christians are fond of boasting, still " towers o'er the wrecks of time " ; it vindicates, as the most practical of all practical politics, those ethical convictions of non-resistance which involved such complete apparent failure. In a word, non-resistance and the Cross are two inseparables. Remove either, and you stultify the other. Posit one, and you explain and vindicate the other. Give one a vital place in your religion, and you are committed to the other. They are the concave and convex sides of the same vessel, the obverse and the reverse of the same genuine coinage.

(*e*) NON-RESISTANCE, THEREFORE, ESSENTIAL TO A FULL CHRISTIAN ETHIC.—If, then, the Cross remains, as by general consent it does, the essence and centre of the Christian gospel, it follows that love involving non-resistance (the moral ground of the Cross in history) must be the essence and centre of the Christian ethic. It is strange indeed that, after so long an acquaintance with Christianity, its documents, and its history, we are still as far as we are from generally recognizing the vital place non-resistance ought to hold in the Christian scheme of things. Yet when we realize the grounds there are for giving it this vital place, we can well understand why it is that the problem of non-resistance again and again thrusts itself pertinaciously on the notice of believers. It lies dormant for generations, even for centuries; it is elbowed out of court by more purely doctrinal interests or less controversial ethical interests; it is smothered by conspiracies of silence; its pretensions are dismissed with a sneer; it is ruled out with an "of course"; it is assailed with charges of legalism, literalism, and idealism; it is passed by as the perquisite of cranks and faddists.[1] Yet it refuses to leave the Christian conscience alone; it clamours for justice; it will not take 'No' for an answer. Like Milton's swarm of flies, it is again and again driven away, but "returns as oft with humming sound." Like Caesar's ghost, it seems to have been got rid of at Sardis, only to turn up again at Philippi. It certainly displays extraordinary vitality for a fad.

(*f*) ITS RIGHTNESS DOES NOT DEPEND UPON IM-

[1] "The Essene would have bidden the soldier shun a profession which implied the destruction of life and was accompanied by so much evil, but John" [the Baptist] "contemplates him continuing in his calling, and only bids him *act justly and avoid outrage and cruelty*. . . . The gospel of John was for men living in the world; the gospel of the Essene was for the recluse, the ascetic, and the eccentric" (Headlam, *LTJC*, pp. 162 f; italics mine).

MEDIATE SUCCESS IN ANY PARTICULAR CASE.—Of the various aspects of this perennial problem, there is one in particular on which the course of thought followed in the preceding pages sheds a clear light. There is a very general belief among Christian people that the policy of overcoming, or endeavouring to overcome, evil with good is the right one for the Christian to pursue whenever it is sure, or practically sure, to succeed immediately. (How we can ever be even practically sure that a thing will succeed until we have tried it is not always considered.) But when there seems grave risk in some particular case that it will fail—at all events for the moment, when it is unlikely to meet with any sympathetic response, when it may be taken for weakness or otherwise misunderstood, when it seems certain to allow a momentary and apparent triumph to evil, then the Christian, it is felt, should abandon it, and "stick at nothing" in order to prevent disaster. Then he may say, with Browning's Luitolfo :

> I tried peace : did that promise, when peace failed,
> Strife should not follow ?

Now the story of the Cross returns a decisive negative to the ethical theory involved in such a dual attitude. For had Jesus and His followers felt themselves justified in reversing their policy of non-resistance whenever adherence to it threatened to allow wrong to score a triumph, clearly they would never have perished as martyrs. For Jesus to act as He did, instead of raising a revolt, was to accept failure, to allow wrong to triumph in the particular case. Every time a martyr was led unresistingly to death, you could have said with reason : "The wrong side has won." Yet underneath all the strange early Christian eschatology lay the deep conviction that Satan cannot cast out Satan, that being

wounded or killed does not make bad men good, that, as God is love and His resources are infinite, evil can be overcome by good and by good only, that the momentary triumph of evil in the particular case is but the necessary prelude and precondition of the ultimate victory of God. And it was only because Jesus and His followers believed this, because they saw that " whatsoever is done of charity, be it never so little and contemptible in the sight of the world, it becometh wholly fruitful," [1] and because they were, therefore, willing to fail in the particular case and to let the consequences look after themselves, that they were able to triumph in the long run and to do those deeds which have been to us the power of God into salvation.[2] There is no escape from the fact that the Cross whereby we are saved owed its existence to the uncompromising pacifism of Him who died upon it, and that the seed which caused the church of God to grow was the blood of pacifist martyrs.

(*g*) The Moral Dilemma presented by the Danger of Others.—It is not possible within the limits of this essay to discuss every one of the various difficulties and objections which a modern reader will feel to lie in the way of putting this central Christian ethic into practice forthwith in his own life. We must pass by, for instance, all that group of problems which centre round the function of civil government, and the distinction it compels us to draw between the

[1] Thomas à Kempis, *Imitation of Christ*, I xv. 1.

[2] As Weinel (p. 117) says of Jesus' determination not to use violence, " Weil er darin ganz feststand, ist er äusserlich gescheitert —und hat er innerlich gesiegt." " I would only ask the reader to pause here to realize that the power to benefit wicked men and at the same time suffer generously and uncomplainingly at their hands, thus attracting their allegiance, is greater than, and wholly opposed to, the power to crush, torture and destroy " (Miss Dougall in *LT*, p. 216).

absolute justification (involving personal self-commitment) due from us to the Christian ethic, and that *relative* justification (entirely consistent with personal abstention) due from us to the honest trust in occasionally injurious coercion, which is felt by non-Christian or perplexed Christian members of a society at best but imperfectly christianized.[1] We must confine ourselves here to a question that weighs still more heavily on the Christian mind. Have we not a duty to defend others, and does not this duty cut right across the ethic of absolute non-resistance?[2] To the bald question, 'Is it our duty to defend others?' only one answer is possible: 'Yes.' But there are two types of defensive method; and 'force' is the wrong word to use for the distinction between them. To start by assuming the question to be, 'Is *force* ever justified?' lands one in confusion. Not only is the word 'force' ambiguous, but the question as so framed is impersonal, and therefore capable of different answers according to the varying moral status and consequently varying responsibility of those contemplated as the agents. The two sorts of defence are the injurious and the non-injurious. The first begins with blows and ends in manslaughter; the second is what we call loosely

[1] This aspect of the problem is discussed in my *Guidance of Jesus for To-day*, pp. 147–174. I may, however, add here—in order to forestall two immediate objections—the following observations:

(1) Relative justification does not equate police-work or war in a good cause with anything and everything anyone may ever think to be right (such, for instance, as head-hunting or religious prostitution). It recognizes objective moral distinctions, and acknowledges that real objective good can be done by those who use coercion (and even violence) from high motives.

(2) Relative justification is not a convenient way of keeping oneself out of danger. Though a refusal, say, to fight necessarily means absence from the actual dangers incidental to using arms on the battlefield, yet plenty of opportunities are open to the objector to convince his fellows by personal self-sacrifice that he is not out to save his skin, and it is his business to use them.

[2] So, e.g., most recently, Headlam in *LTJC*, pp. 226 f.

'moral suasion,' but does not necessarily exclude all physical resistance. More explicit than that we cannot be—while arguing the matter in its general aspects—without falling into unrealities. The question, then, is: 'Ought a true and enlightened Christian ever to use the injurious method?' Before framing a dogmatic answer, let us bear in mind:

(i) That non-injurious defence has again and again proved itself effective [1];
(ii) That it has been most successfully used by those who were known to abjure totally the use of injurious defence [2];
(iii) That neither method is absolutely certain to be successful in any particular case: hence possibility of failure is no more fatal as an objection to the non-injurious method than it is to the injurious.

If we examine closely the typical situations so often advanced in argument on this question, we shall find a very large percentage of them must be discounted on the ground either of their sheer unreality (assaults on women, for instance, are not for the most part made in the presence of their male friends at all) or of their exemplifying the probably greater efficacy of non-injurious, as compared with injurious, defence (e.g. with a burglar in the house or an enemy-soldier in the town). There will, however, remain a certain class of cases which cannot be so disposed of—extremely rare

[1] As instances, we may think of Jesus and the Gerasene maniac, of the aged St. John and the robber, of the Quakers of Pennsylvania, and of numerous cases in the mission-field. See *The Arm of God*, by R. and E. Dunkerley (Oliphants, 1918). Headlam (*LTJC* 227) concedes the general point.

[2] Salvationists and other slum-workers would obviously lose most of their great influence over degraded characters, were they suspected of intentions to coerce.

instances, in which the danger to others seems real, and moral suasion seems hopeless. Exactly how far, in face of such menace (which even so is not certainty), the Christian ought to go, it would be foolish, in a general argument where there are no specific details before us, to try to determine. But this at least may be said. The fact that a certain moral conviction involves the risk of agonizing tragedy in a margin of extreme situations does not prove that moral conviction to be wrong. Life is so complex that we are continually being faced with moral dilemmas—situations in which a choice has to be made between conflicting moral considerations, i.e. in which some moral consideration has to be sacrificed in deference to another of greater weight. It is sad that it should be so; but so it is. Most of these dilemmas are of a familiar and simple kind, involving little or no hesitation or distress. Others are more serious and perplexing; occasionally they involve acute pain. The man with a high sense of duty always runs the risk of having, in some exceptional crisis, to choose between two moral goods both of which are of very high value. The right choice may involve a moral sacrifice of the acutest and cruellest kind. Such dilemmas Jesus had in mind when He said: "He that loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me." Such a dilemma did Perpetua face when she forsook her aged father and her young child because the State would not let her live for them unless she denied her Christianity. Such a dilemma confronted that Belgian soldier who is said to have been threatened with having to see wife and children maltreated before his eyes unless he would give military information to the enemy. Such a dilemma was proposed to the military representative at a tribunal, who was asked what he would do if, while carrying despatches on the

speedy delivery of which the fate of an army depended, he passed his own home and observed the enemy about to raid it. However such cases may harrow our feelings, we yet do not condemn adherence to a supreme moral principle on the ground that it involves—in some exceptional or unique situation—the terrible sacrifice of some other principle, great, but not equally great. We cannot lay it down as an à priori certainty that no situation will ever arise in which we may feel called upon to undergo that extreme form of martyrdom, the sight of the suffering and death of the ones we love. The golden rule seems to limit our method of defending others to that with which we should like to be defended ourselves, i.e. ex hypothesi, the non-injurious method. That this method may in certain cases involve the risk of tragic sacrifice is, of course, true. But if military men have been able—and that without social disapproval—to contemplate themselves as enduring the worst agony a husband and a father can suffer, and enduring it for the sake of the army or the country to which they belong, is it inconceivable that a Christian ought to be equally unflinching when the central ethic of the Kingdom of God is at stake? Is militant patriotism to be praised *although* it may involve the suffering of others dear to us, and the peace-making ethic of Jesus to be censured and repudiated *because* it may involve precisely the same thing?

If this be thought an imperfect apologia, let it be remembered that in ethical philosophy, as in metaphysics, it is not given to us to attain to complete finality in our constructions, particularly in their remoter implications. But it does not follow from this that the constructions themselves are unsound. We must not confuse an objection to a position with a refutation of it. That is one of the logical fallacies.

There are objections, and fatal objections. It is not enough to say: "You have given no satisfactory answer to the question, 'Must I not defend my wife and children?'" The objector is at liberty to consider our answer unsatisfactory; but he is not at liberty to treat his objection as a disproof of our argument for systematic non-resistance unless and until he can produce a better and more comprehensive ethical system, one which not only allows injury in defence of the weak, but relates that injury organically to the whole range of Gospel-teaching which explicitly condemns injury. Is any one of my readers able to produce an ethic which justifies the injurious defence of others, but which does not by implication justify also the injurious defence of oneself, and so quite patently depart from Jesus' clear teaching and deep convictions on that matter? "If any, speak; for him have I offended. I pause for a reply."

(*h*) The Cost of the Christian Resurrection.—We return, then, to our main position. The Cross and non-resistance stand or fall together. Their vital unity explains the perpetual recurrence of the problem of non-resistance; and the failure to face that problem and to find and preach the solution of it explains the feebleness of the Message about the Cross as the Church of to-day tries to deliver it. The mind of man is newly awake to the ethical side of Christianity and to the break-down of traditional versions of it; and the time has now gone by for preaching a gospel of the Cross unaccompanied by the advocacy and practice of the ethic of the Cross. Paul, at any rate, was perfectly well aware that he could not hope to know the power of Christ's resurrection without knowing also the fellowship of His sufferings, that he could not attain to the resurrection from the dead without being

moulded into the likeness of His death, that he could not present every man perfect in Christ without filling up in his own flesh the deficiencies of Christ's afflictions.[1] That does not mean, when translated into modern terms, that the Christian must needs die like his Master on a cross of wood ; but it certainly does mean something much more definite than a mere general " loyalty to His spirit," which for some is a sufficient explication of their Christian commitments. It cannot surely mean less than a complete acceptance of that policy of overcoming evil with good, which was in history the one tangible ground for the death on the Cross. The Christian cannot expect serious inquirers to listen long to him if, though preaching fervently about the Cross of Jesus, he shows no appreciation of the distinctive ethic that led Jesus to that Cross, and no intention of following that ethic himself—if he shows faith in it only when it is almost certain to be immediately successful, but abandons it whenever it threatens temporary failure. Such abandonment, in Jesus' own case, would have prevented the crucifixion, have cancelled the distinctive message of Christianity, and so have destroyed the prospect of any future for Christianity as a world-religion. Such abandonment, if practised by the martyrs, would have atrophied the seed of the Church. And such abandonment, whether overtly commended (as during the recent war) or tacitly approved (by the Church's silence in peace), cannot be expected to advance the cause of Christianity in our own day. We must grasp afresh what Jesus' insight into the meaning of love has shown us, and must make a new effort to apply it all round in practical daily life. If this means possible loss and suffering, even possible martyrdom, we ought not to account

[1] Phil iii. 10 f ; Col i. 24.

that strange, with the history of the early Church before our eyes. We must not be surprised if, in pursuing that policy of love-to-the-uttermost which brought Jesus to the apparent failure of the Cross, we too are often brought face to face with apparent failure: still less must we plead that the very thing, failure—which in His case was the occasion for His resurrection—in our case has to be the reason for our not incurring the sufferings. "The call to the supreme sacrifice does not actually come to the majority of Christians, though potentially it comes to all. And we have to beware lest, if it comes to us, we be found wanting." [1] We must be prepared to fail again and again in the particular case, as the price of winning in the long run a victory all along the line—a victory which cannot be won at any lower cost.

Jesus often had occasion to remonstrate with His followers over their lack of faith and to encourage them to be more adventurous in their reliance on faith. "Faith in what?" we may ask. Faith in Jesus and in all that He stood for. "And how can we put to ourselves what He stood for?" His life, His spirit, His teaching, His conduct, His death, His resurrection-power—all these tell the same story: namely, that God's chosen instrument for the achievement of His dearest ends is infinite love, untiring in its endurance of rebuffs, and ceaseless in its personal appeal and in its moral challenge, and that, for the enhancement of this instrument's efficacy, God desires the co-operation of men who will grow to be more and more like Himself by becoming extremists in good-will.

[1] A. Robertson in *The Hibbert Journal*, April 1923, p. 532.

PRINTED BY UNWIN BROTHERS, LIMITED, LONDON AND WOKING, GREAT BRITAIN

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD.
London: 40 Museum Street, W.C.1
Cape Town: 73 St. George's Street
Sydney, N.S.W.: 218–222 Clarence Street
Wellington, N.Z.: 110–112 Lambton Quay

# The Historical Jesus

## By C. PIEPENBRING

*Cr. 8vo.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

The author of this book devotes seven chapters to presenting the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, elaborating more particularly the points which he considers to have been inadequately treated in Professor Loisy's Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels. Dr. Piepenbring concludes with a careful examination of the parallels drawn between the tenets of the Galilean teacher and the doctrines inculcated by Lao-tse and Epictetus respectively, and shows wherein the Christian standards excel both the other ideals. The author's earlier Biblical studies are well known, and this volume forms a valuable addition to the Christology of the day.

# Authority in Religion

## By EDWARD GRUBB, M.A.

*Cr. 8vo.* Author of "The Bible: Its Nature and Inspiration" 3*s.* 6*d.*

This is a freshly-written study of the problem of Authority, though some use has been made of the author's earlier book, "Authority and the Light Within," which is now out of print. He believes that while the outward authorities in which men have tried to find an infallible standard of belief and conduct have severally failed to make good their claim, an Inward Authority remains and is sufficient. This is found in the self-evidencing power with which the supreme values of life appeal to the soul that is clean and open-eyed. Faith is no blind submission to authority, but the venture of living as if, in a world that often seems to deny them, the supreme values held; and Jesus Christ is objectively its greatest example and subjectively its highest source. The book should appeal to many who are perplexed.

# Living Issues in Religious Thought

## From George Fox to Bertrand Russell

## By Professor H. G. WOOD

*Cr. 8vo.* (*Selly Oak Colleges Publications*, No. 6) 6*s.*

"The courtesy of the true scholar lives in these pages . . . which have a real value in setting thought to work upon some of the fundamental religious issues of the day."—*Weekly Westminster.*

## Modern Religious Cults and Movements

By G. GLENN ATKINS, D.D.

*La. Cr. 8vo.* 10*s.* 6*d.*

"An interesting and scholarly account. . . . Anyone who wishes to get a connected account of present-day speculation on religious subjects . . . may be confidently advised to consult this work."—*Guardian.*

## The Discovery of God

By BASIL KING

*Cr. 8vo.* Author of "The Conquest of Fear" 7*s.* 6*d.*

Few people have read the Bible with a mind open to the wonderful stories contained in it. Reverence has blinded us to the fascinating colour and romance of those early shepherd kings who found great revelations waiting for them in the desert. Mr. King's aim in this book is to send readers to the Bible with a new enthusiasm and a new insight.

## The Mystical Quest of Christ

By Rev. R. F. HORTON, D.D.

*La. Cr. 8vo.* *Cheaper Edition* 5*s.*

"A book packed with good things, rich in illustrations from history, literature and life, no less enriched by the author's personal experiences."—*British Weekly.*

## Foundations of Faith

First Series: Theological

*Cr. 8vo.* By Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. 5*s.*

"It would be hard to find among post-war theological books a cheaper five shillings worth."—*Church Times.*

# THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION SERIES

EDITED BY NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A.

**The Christian Revolution**
By Dr. HENRY T. HODGKIN — Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**The Constructive Revolution of Jesus**
By PROFESSOR SAMUEL DICKEY — Cr. 8vo, 6s.; Paper, 3s. 6d.

**Religion and Biology**
By ERNEST E. UNWIN, M.Sc. — Cr. 8vo, 6s.

**Essays in Christian Thinking**
By A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D. — Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

**Christian Justice**
By NORMAN L. ROBINSON, M.A. — Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

**Christ and Cæsar**
By N. MICKLEM AND HERBERT MORGAN — Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

**The Meaning of Paul for To-day** By PROFESSOR
C. H. DODD, M.A. *Second Impression.* — Cr. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

**The Remnant** By RUFUS M. JONES — Cr. 8vo, 5s. 6d.

**The Christ of Revolution**
By JOHN R. COATES, B.A. — Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s.; Paper, 3s.

**The Way to Personality** By GEORGE B. ROBSON
*Third Edition.* — Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s. 6d.; Paper, 3s. 6d.

**The Christian Ideal** By W. E. WILSON — Cr. 8vo, 5s. 6d.

**The Open Light** By NATHANIEL MICKLEM — Cr. 8vo, 5s.

**Reconciliation and Reality**
By W. FEARON HALLIDAY *Second Impression.* — Cr. 8vo, 5s.

**The Early Christian Attitude to War**
By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D. — Cr. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

**Lay Religion** By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A. — Cr. 8vo, 4s.

**Man and His Buildings**
By T. S. ATLEE, A.R.I.B.A. *Illustrated.* — Cr. 8vo, 6

**The Kingship of God**
By GEORGE B. ROBSON — Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 5s.; Paper, 3

**Economic Justice**
By GERARD COLLIER, M.A. — Cr. 8vo, Cloth, 7s. 6d.; Paper, 5

*All Prices are net*

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET W.C. 1.

232.3
C125

Cadoux, C.J.

AUTHOR

The Message About
The Cross

TITLE

S38879

| DATE DUE | BORROWER'S NAME |
| --- | --- |
| APR 29 '88 | DANIEL L. RUNKE |
| | 131681 326 |
| MR 15 '95 | K. Lindsay 2000 |

232.3
C125

S38879

Bethel Theological
SEMINARY
LIBRARY
New Brighton, Minn. - 55112